DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 837 PS 018 435

AUTHOR Chant, Deborah, Ed.
TITLE Work and Family: New Partnerships. Work and Family Conference Proceedings (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, November 30-December 2, 1988).
INSTITUTION Ryerson Polytechnical Inst., Toronto (Ontario). School of Early Childhood Education.
SPONS AGENCY Ontario Women's Directorate, Ottawa.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 100p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Day Care; Community Information Services; Community Responsibility; *Day Care; Dual Career Family; Early Childhood Education; *Employed Parents; Employer Supported Day Care; Family Environment; *Family Life; Foreign Countries; Fringe Benefits; *International Programs; *Labor Conditions; Productivity; Program Development; *Public Policy; Social Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; Group Day Care; United States

ABSTRACT

This conference involving business, labor, policymakers and dependent care service providers covered issues related to the conflict between family and work responsibilities. The conference addressed the conflict's scope, substance, and major issues. Also covered are: information-gathering efforts which concerned institutions' national and international activity in the area, employees' and employers' needs and resources, governmental and legal approaches to the conflict, and individual and corporate activities and services designed to meet the needs of employees and employers. Plenary sessions and workshops concerned: (1) family and work conditions in the United States; (2) child care and productivity; (3) international work and family programs; (4) innovation, research, and emerging trends; (5) directions of policy concerning work and family; (5) flexible leave policies and practices; (6) solutions to problems faced by labor and management; (7) creation of work and family programs in the workplace; (8) employer-supported child care programs, group-based care, resource and referral services, and elderly dependent care; and (9) dimensions of labor's and business's shared responsibility for making needed changes. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED321837

WORK AND FAMILY NEW PARTNERSHIPS

WORK & FAMILY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ontario Women's Directorate

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PS 018435

Work and Family Conference Proceedings

RYERSON

Ontario

RYERSON

Ontario Women's Directorate

Direction générale de la condition féminine de l'Ontario

It is our pleasure to present the proceedings of the Work and Family: New Partnerships conference held in Toronto, November 30, and December 1 and 2, 1988. This important event was co-sponsored by the Ministry of Community and Social Services, Government of Ontario and by Ryerson Polytechnical Institute.

Work and family are closely connected realities that affect one another. Many employees experience ongoing stress as they try to provide care for their children or elderly dependents and fulfil their workplace responsibilities simultaneously. Increasingly, employers are recognizing the interdependence of work and family and showing interest in developing corporate policies and programs which will help to resolve work and family conflicts and positively impact performance and productivity.

This conference presented practical case studies of existing policy and practice. It supported the extension of networking and the formation of new alliances. The major underlying theme of the conference, which enjoyed the participation of a wide variety of experts from all sectors, was cross-sector partnership involving business, labour and the public sector.

We wish to express our appreciation and gratitude to all those involved in planning and hosting this successful venture. Their work has helped to set the stage for future developments concerning the successful harmonization of work and family life. We hope you find these proceedings useful as you look into this critical social and economic issue.

Honourable Gregory Sorbara
Minister Responsible for
Women's Issues

Terry Grier
President
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

These conference proceedings have been compiled by the School of Early Childhood Education, Ryerson. Appreciation is extended to the Ontario Women's Directorate, Government of Ontario, for the Change Agent Grant to produce these proceedings; to Sandra Handscomb who assisted in the preparation of this document and to Mary Helen Spence for her ideas and comments.

PREFACE

The impetus for sponsoring this conference came from the desire to focus attention on the increasing challenge of families balancing the demands of their work life and family life.

We recognized that this issue was not just a problem experienced by employees, but was also impacting on employers, as individuals sought ways to relieve the pressures and stresses of this conflict. There was also the realization that the search for solutions to these issues did not lie with any one constituency. Instead, the exploration of effective remedies lay in assembling representatives from a variety of communities: business, labour, policy makers and dependent care service providers.

The plenary sessions and workshops were designed to present a broad exposure to the current thinking and practices that comprise the topic of work and family. They were categorized into four main areas.

The first area addresses the scope, substance and major issues. Ellen Galinsky speaks to this theme in the keynote presentation in which she describes the current situation in the United States. She vividly portrays the nature of the changing workforce and a workplace which has not kept pace. This situation has created a tremendous need for services in both child care and elder care. The creative solutions and emerging trends, established largely by corporations in response to these changes, are discussed. Kathy Gallagher-Ross identifies the issues of work and family life as they have developed in Canada. She strongly maintains that the issues can be effectively resolved through the recognition of the need for parental choice and the collaboration of all parties. This latter characteristic is captured in the concluding forum as representatives of business (employer-employee), government and labour gather to jointly examine the actions that need to be taken to move towards achieving a quality of life which adequately balances work and family needs.

The second category focuses on various information-gathering efforts which have been undertaken to determine both national and international institutional activity in this area and to explore employee/employer needs and resources. John Fernandez's discussion of Child Care and Productivity provides employers with information on how an employee's family responsibility can impact adversely on their job performance. From Brigette Kitchen, the reader is introduced to significant leave and benefit programs as practiced in Britain, France, West Germany and Sweden. Various research iniatives conducted among a number of Canadian corporations and their employees are reviewed in Innovation, Research and Emerging Trends.

In the third area, comprised of three sessions, the focus turns to governmental and legal approaches to the topic. Naomi Alboim describes the leadership role of the Ontario Women's Directorate, in developing policy and promoting initiatives that integrate work and family life. A very comprehensive review of the current legislation on leaves and benefits is provided by Monica Townson. In addition, two lawyers discuss examples of how these policies may become operationalized in instances of collective bargaining.

The last category describes activities and services which have been developed by individuals and corporations to meet the needs of both employees and employers. As an introduction to these various programs, Julie White offers a series of broad guidelines for implementing work and family iniatives in the workplace. In the next sessions, focussing on the child care domain, the reader is introduced to on-site and near-site workplace day care, information, referral and counselling services. Start-up and administrative operations of the group-care programs are described. Some corporations have elected to adopt database resource and referral services, instead of on-site child care; a number of these options are presented. Elder care gathers more and more attention and a panel of community and business representatives address the needs of employees facing dependent care responsibilities.

I wish to take the opportunity to thank the President of Ryerson, Terence Grier and the Minister Responsible for Women's Issues, the Honorable Gregory Sorbara for their welcoming statements of support and encouragement at the opening reception of the conference.

I am pleased to present the reader with this collection of materials presented at the conference by knowledgeable and distinguished individuals who are active in the "work and family" field. It is hoped that the conference and this resultant report will fuel the momentum towards achieving the policies and practices which are necessary to create a fairer and more humane workplace.

Deborah Chant
Professor, School of Early Childhood Education, Ryerson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPENING ADDRESS: VII
Terence Grier,
President, Ryerson

WELCOMING ADDRESS: VIII
The Honorable Gregory Sorbara,
Minister Responsible for Women's Issues,
Government of Ontario

KEYNOTE PLENARY:
Towards New Partnerships 1
Ellen Galinsky,
Director of Work and Family Studies, Bank Street College

Response to Ellen Galinsky 10
Kathy Gallagher Ross,
Conference Chair

WORKSHOPS:
Child Care and Productivity 12
John Fernandez,
Private Management Consultant

International Programs in Work and Family 18
Brigitte Kitchen,
Associate Professor, York University

Innovation, Research and Emerging Trends 23
Sue Griggs,
Consultant, Working Families Project
Laura Johnson,
Research Director,
The Child, Youth and Family Policy Research Centre
Judy MacBride-King,
Research Associate, The Conference Board of Canada
Mark Frankel,
President, M.L. Frankel & Associates

Policy Directions in Work and Family 34
Naomi Alboim,
Assistant Deputy Minister, Ontario Women's Directorate,
Government of Ontario

PLENARY:
Flexible Leave Policies and Practices 40
Monica Townson,
Economist, Monica Townson & Associates, Inc.

WORKSHOPS:

Labour and Management: In Search of Effective Solutions 53
Paula Rusak,
Partner, Mathews Dinsdale & Clark
Larry Steinberg,
Partner, Koskie & Minsky

PLENARY:
Introduction 56
Richard Bradley,
Manager, Legislation Unit, Child Care Branch,
Ministry of Community & Social Services,
Government of Ontario

Creating Work and Family Programs in Your Workplace 61
Julie White,
National Manager of Public Affairs, Levi Strauss, Inc.

WORKSHOPS:
Employer-Supported Child Care: Group-Based Care
Sunnybrook Creche
Bice Awan, Director,
Catherine Priske,
Private Consultant, Preschool Services
Newpark Day Care Centre, Magna International
Wendy Campbell,
Director, Newpark Day Care
Fashion District Day Care Centre
Jane Beach,
Program Policy Analyst, Child Care Branch,
Ministry of Community & Social Services,
Government of Ontario

Employer-Supported Child Care: Resource and Referral Services 67
Cherie Wright,
Staff Services Co-Ordinator,
The Manufacturers Life Insurance Company
John Mills
Manager, Xerox Canada, Inc.
Karen Liberman,
President, Families That Work

Elderly Dependent Care 72
Dick Barnhorst,
Executive Director,
The Child, Youth & Family Policy Research Centre
Sally MacEwan,
Social Worker, Family Service Association
Lisa Taerk,
Director, Kin Care
Margo Potter,
Manager, Toronto Dominion Bank

FORUM: A SHARED RESPONSIBILITY? 78

Valerie Pringle, (Moderator)
Broadcaster, CBC Midday
Martin Elliott,
Manager, Atomic Energy of Canada
Roger Purdie,
Vice President, Research, Esso Petroleum Canada
Jeff Rose,
National President,
Canadian Union of Public Employees
Elaine Todres,
Deputy Minister, Human Resources Secretariat,
Government of Ontario

CLOSING REMARKS: 88

Milton Orris,
Dean of Continuing Education, Ryerson

OPENING ADDRESS

Terence Grier
President of Ryerson

This important conference deals with a topic which a great many of us in the broader public need some help with. It recognizes that work life and family life cannot be bounded into separate territories, each with its own distinct set of interests and activities. It will examine the means by which family and work life can be positively integrated, both for employees and employers, drawing on existing models. It will underline the need for continuing discussion amongst all of us who have a stake in this issue.

It struck me last night as I was reflecting on the conference, that the need to integrate work and family life must surely be a phenomenon of modern urban industrial society. When life was on the land, or in a more agricultural setting, I should have thought that work and family life would indeed be very well integrated. There was a time, and in historical terms, probably the vast span of time, when such integration was the natural order of things. It strikes me, as a total novice in the field, that we are not so much breaking new ground as attempting to restore an order, pattern and integration that was very much part of our natural evolution.

In any event, we at Ryerson are pleased to be sponsoring this conference in conjunction with the Government of Ontario's Ministry of Community and Social Services, and with assistance from the Womens' Directorate. It reflects our commitment to the objectives of the conference which include moving from a sole focus on child care to a more holistic approach in which we draw on a variety of mechanisms which integrate work and family life.

I cannot help observing how badly we employers need help in this area. This is especially so in the public sector where there are no surpluses or profits which can be diverted to support initiatives. We need help in imaginative ways in which integration of work and family life can be accomplished within the resources that government places at our disposal. So, speaking very personally, I welcome the conference and look forward to its outcome.

We are fortunate tonight to have with us the Minister of Labour, the Honourable Gregory Sobara, whom I got to know when he was Minister of Colleges and Universities, to which position he was appointed after he was elected to the Legislature for the first time in the election of 1985. I think it is fair to say that Greg Sorbara made a strong impression in the two years that he held that portfolio. It was a period of some important changes in approaches to funding. All of us felt that we had in the Minister of Colleges and Universities someone who carried weight in Cabinet, who understood what the universities were saying -- not only administration but faculty and students – and whose initiatives in that area reflected that sensitivity. Greg has now gone to a new portfolio as Minister of Labour with also, as I understand it, very significant responsibilities in the field of womens' issues which bear directly on the topic of the conference tonight. Welcome Greg.

WELCOMING ADDRESS

The Honorable Gregory Sorbara
Minister of Labour and Minister Responsible For Women's Issues
Province of Ontario

The issue of work and family responsibilities, and the harmonization thereof is terribly important and sits squarely on the agenda of Ministers of Labour and Ministers Responsible For Womens' Issues wherever they may be, certainly on this continent, and I would suggest to you, anywhere in the western world. Anywhere that has an economy similar to ours.

Welcome, I understand we have representatives from all over Canada and the United States as well. It is a timely conference and timely for me, as a Minister. The blending of career and home life really is emerging as one of the paramount issues of the '90's. It is not just a women's issue, it is a men's issue as well. It is rapidly becoming an issue for every one of us. On the way over here, as a matter of fact, the last thing I did before I left my office was sit down with a senior person on my own staff to discuss how we might assist another member of my office in harmonizing her work and family responsibilities. How we could restructure the work day and the work assignment so that one member could step back a little bit from the terribly pressurized work of a Minister's office.

On the way over here, through the wonders of modern technology, I was able to phone home to make sure that in our family of nine the person who was scheduled to cook dinner tonight was cooking dinner, and someone else was going to pick up my daughter and take her from her piano lesson to a play that she had to go to with her school tonight. I also checked to ensure that when I got home the work that I had to do would be waiting for me. Now we can all sleep soundly tonight knowing we have looked after the family responsibilities as well as the work responsibilities.

The issue of insuring that we as a society, as a Province, as a Nation, are doing the right things for that sort of harmonization has become an important issue of pubic policy. It is good that that is happening because, as it seems to me, most of our statutes, most of our regulations, most of the programming that we do in government, and indeed most of our institutions as we created them, whether they be public sector, broader public sector or private sector, have been created and designed based on what I tend to refer to as 'the father knows best' model. If you are hovering around 40 years of age then you may have spent a few of your younger years watching Father Knows Best. The title implies everything. The program reflected a model of society that obviously never existed but was stylized in a way that had one gender out in the workplace returning every evening precisely at 5:30 p.m. to kiss children, pick up newspaper and prepare to sit down for dinner which the other gender had dutifully prepared in time for it all to come together neatly at 6:00 in the evening (even though we were watching at 7:30).

Remember that this traditional model really has been in the mind of governments and institutions, private and public, as we created, institutionalization of many things, particularly during the late '50's and early '60's. Certainly, the employment standards provisions of the Government of Ontario tend to reflect that -- programs that have been designed by government in general tend to reflect that. The fact is that that traditional model, if it ever existed, certainly does not exist today. Actually, only one out of six families fits that traditional model. The reality for most is something that all of us are very familiar with -- families where both parents, or a single parent are full-time participants in the workplace and children are very busy participating in a variety of activities related to school and community.

Unfortunately, we have not yet created the kind of revolution in our laws, regulations and programs that is required to fit the new model. I think if this conference is going to do anything, it is going to help all of us, particularly those of us in government, to identify where we need to be going, what structural changes we need to be making, how we need to be reshaping the way in which we organize ourselves as a society in order to accommodate the new reality. Marshall McLuhan said that most of us go through life looking in the rear view mirror, believing that is really what is in front of us. We must now take away the rear view mirror and understand that we have to reshape our society to reflect what real people are doing as they live their lives.

In this respect we will be working toward equality of both genders more quickly. We will also be enhancing the capacity for our workplaces to be productive. I think there is a community of interest here, a very important community of interest. I believe that as we study these questions what will bring us together is that community or interests that somehow we all feel will help to reshape our institutions.

When we discuss this within government, and I should tell you it is a focal point of what is going on within government and a very important one, sometimes I am overwhelmed by the extent to which changes must be made. I am overwhelmed by the extent to which we are not the repository of all of the answers. I am glad this conference is happening and I look forward to the results that you will achieve here and the submissions that you will make to government when your deliberations are finished.

There are some things going on in government and I just want to mention a few of them. First of all I want to tell you that at the First Ministers' Conference in this country back in November 1987, First Ministers approved a strategy paper submitted by the Province of Ontario on the changing relationship between work and family responsibilites. The First Ministers directed all Ministers Responsible for the Status of Women to develop, in co-ordination with all other relevant Ministries, a strategy to promote the harmonious integration of work and family responsibilities. Now, within the Province of Ontario, the Ontario Womens' Directorate chairs a government-wide committee representing 16 Ministries that is developing our Provincial strategy. This strategy will be presented at the 1989 First Ministers' Conference.

This is actually rather exciting because it pulls together Ministries that might not want to acknowledge that change is needed in this area and focuses the collective attention of Government on this topic.

We are doing some other things as well within the Directorate. We are participating in the Conference Board of Canada's Research Project. I see representatives of the Conference Board of Canada here this evening. We made a financial contribution to the project and we have a member sitting on the Advisory Board. The Directorate is also working with the Ministry of Community and Social Services, a co-sponsor of this conference, to produce a publication designed to raise employer awareness of this issue. The Directorate will present examples of successful employer programs for helping employees balance their work and family responsibilities. This, by the way, is very, very important – this business of identifying successful initiatives and using those as models for other employers, other worker organizations, other associations looking for models. The fact is, we do not have a great deal of experience. I was just talking with Karen Liberman about how there is a sort of crying out amongst organizations, employers large and small, for iniatives that will help them cope. At the same time there is just a beginning of a realization amongst other employers that something needs to be done here but they do not quite know what it is.

If we have successful models and we can use those in other environments we will spread the word and bring about the necessary changes more quickly than otherwise.

You have a very impressive agenda and I think some great things will come out of this conference. The players are there and on the agenda that need to be there, including my own Assistant Deputy Minister, Naomi Alboim who will be here tomorrow leading one of the sessions. I believe you have the community of interest amongst employers, labour and government to really create a sort of synergy. I look forward to hearing about your deliberations.

TOWARDS NEW PARTNERSHIPS

Ellen Galinsky

What I would like to talk about this morning is to describe what is happening in the United States concerning work and family life. First, I will discuss the changes in the family, the labour force and the economy. Then I will address the impact that those changes have had on employees and productivity, how employers across the country have responded to these changes within the work force and how those efforts of employers affect productivity. Finally, I will summarize the current trends in work and family life in the United States.

Currently, 65% of mothers with children 18 and under are in the labour force. The most dramatic change concerns mothers with young children. Fifty-three per cent of mothers of infants are now employed. As a result, the labour force has also shifted. Right now the labour force in the United States consists of 37% working parents, 17% of whom have children under six. There is a report that has become almost like a Bible for employers in the United States. It was prepared by the Hudson Institute and is called *Workforce 2000*. It describes the way the labour force in the year 2000 is projected to be: increasingly female. Sixty-four per cent of all new entrants to the labour force are going to be women. This report also describes the fact that the workforce in the United States is going to be increasingly minority and increasingly aging. In fact, if you look at the demographics portrayed pictorially, it looks like a tree. You have the baby boomers and senior citizens like the big branches of the tree and the baby busters like the trunk with a little blip on the tree bark called the baby boomlet. In addition, the labour force is continuing to age in our country. Because the baby bust generation is now entering the labour force there are growing labour shortages. The number of 16-24 year olds in the United States has dropped about 2 million between 1980 and 1990. We just conducted a survey for *Fortune Magazine* about two weeks ago and interviewed executives at Fortune 500 companies. We found that six out of every ten were experiencing labour shortages right now with entry level people.

There are also changes in the economy. The United States is increasingly owned by foreign investors. We are also moving to an information-based society. The kinds of skills that workers needed to work in industrial and service societies will not hold up well in an information economy. Workers are going to need much more complicated and sophisticated skills to survive. All of these facts raise new issues for both employers and employees.

For the employers the issue is managing a diverse workforce. Within the context of global competition the United States can no longer be seen as a country that is just affected by what happens within the country, but is deeply impacted by what happens in the world as evidenced by the October 19 stock market crash triggered in Japan last year.

Within the family the issue is work/family conflict. We ask a question in our research that we have been doing at Bank Street for the last decade and we ask it in every survey we do: How difficult or easy is it for you to balance your work and family responsibilities? The lowest number that we have ever had say it was really hard was 39%. If people have infants and toddlers that number tends to go up to the high 60 to 70 per cent range. Two to three out of every five workers are having a hard time managing what they have to do on the job and at home. Recently, a speaker at a conference at the Conference Board said "If you don't think that these are problems then you have exactly the right policies, however, if you do see them as problems we need to think about changes".

The first question I would like to talk about is, what are the problems that people have in balancing their work and family life? I am going to talk predominantly about child care but also describe some of the other problems that have emerged from the research that we and others are doing. When I describe our research I am talking about a number of studies that we have done over the past ten years at Bank Street College.

When we have looked at child care, we have tried to identify what specifically is hard for parents in managing responsibilities with children when they are employed. We found there are several issues. The first is that in the United States child care is hard to find. That has two components: it is difficult to locate where the sources of child care are in their community. One parent described it like a secret society. You do not know what the

password is until you get into it. You need to figure out what is out there and how do you find out about it? In the surveys that we have done at about ten corporations over the past year we find that about half the people have a hard time finding out about the available sources of child care. If they have infants, the figure is closer to 65%.

Parents may find child care but it may not be suitable for them; it may be too expensive, it may not be where they need to go in terms of their commute; they may take one of the children but not another one and so on. In many parts of the urban areas of the United States there are long waiting lists. Thus, parents may locate child care but are not able to get in. We have many stories of men and women who put their names on waiting lists when they conceive and a year later they are still on the waiting list.

When we look at this issue of finding out about and obtaining child care we find that, that is one of our two major predictors of absenteeism. People who have a hard time finding child care are much more likely to be absent from work. The other major predictor of absenteeism is being a woman and we know why that is: women tend to take the responsibility for family issues.

The second issue for parents is that some arrangements are more satisfactory than others. The research that has been done has generally looked at the type of arrangements that parents use, that is, family day care vs centre care vs in-home care. Art Emlen and Paul Koren at Portland State in Oregon have found that those workers who use "latch-key care" (they have children taking care of themselves or their younger siblings), are much more likely to be absent from work. If the average number of days missed in the United States is somewhere between 7-9 days then people who have children in self-care are likely to miss 13 days. For this group it seems that men miss even a little bit more time than women do. Men miss 13.4 days as compared to women's 13 days. I think you see men's participation in these issues changing. In a survey which we did for *Fortune Magazine* we asked, "How much do you and your spouse share the care of your child?" Women's rates are higher when the children are young and men's rates become higher when the children are older. Another example: When I conduct seminars about working parents and teenagers, the audience generally has quite a few men in it.

We know that in the United States quality of child care varies enormously. If you ask a group of parents about whether they like their child care, 95% of them will generally say "Yes". It is very hard to admit that you do not like the care that you use. *USA Today* just did a poll and they found 94-96% liked their child care. But, if you ask the question more specifically like, How satisfied are you with the cost, the attention your child receives, the security that you feel, the location of the child care to work and home, you find that number goes down. If you ask how much the children like the care, the number goes down again. For those of you doing research it is important to look at this issue in a more complex way.

Beth Shinn from New York University and I are doing a study, looking at how variations in quality of child care as independently assessed affect parents on the job. We have professional assessments of the child care in a number of programs throughout the city of Atlanta, Georgia. We will be able to analyze whether there is an impact on parents in terms of their stress, health and so forth as it relates to variations in quality. We know that the quality of child care really goes from just awful to wonderful in the United States.

Another issue that affects parents is that they are not just making one child care arrangement. They are putting together a patchwork system, particularly in those years when children enter kindergarten and have a 2 1/2 hour program. You have to have child care before the children go to school and child care after they come home from school and it may be a different arrangement on different days of the week. Then as children get involved in sports or other things it gets even more complicated. I did an article for *Good Housekeeping* in September in which I interviewed parents about managing work and family responsibilities. One parent described a very common phenomenon which is called the 'refrigerator chart': parents write their children's names down the side of the chart and write the days of the week across the top. They write their child care arrangements in different coloured magic markers because otherwise they can not keep straight who picks up whom on which day.

We find in our research, that parents make on the average of 1.7 arrangements per children 12 and under. It is the 7/10th of the arrangement that drives parents crazy. What it really means is that some parents have one arrangement and some parents have a lot. In the *Fortune* study we

found that there were an average of 3 to 4 arrangements in each family.

The reason that this patchwork system is important is that the more arrangements parents have the more likely those arrangements are to fall apart. We find that this has the most negative impact on parents' productivity. It is having arrangements that fall apart, having to make last-minute arrangements because it is a snow day and child care or school is closed but work is not. Another reason for what we call "child care breakdown" is that children get sick. Another cause in the United States increasingly, is child care provider turnover. What we found in the *Fortune* study, a nationally representative sample, is that 1 out of 4 men and women had to make between 2 and 5 special arrangements in the past three months because their regular arrangement had fallen apart. The more frequent the child care breakdown the more negative the repercussions. These parents are more likely to come to work late, to leave early, to be absent from work and to worry about their children while at work. A study by Brad Googins and Diane Burden in New England, found that 1 out of every 4 parents worry about their children "all the time" or "almost all the time" while at work. We also find that such parents are more at risk for higher levels of stress and more stress-related health problems. We have a measure in our research of stress-related health problems that are very significantly correlated with physical illness. This measure includes backaches, pains in the neck, headaches, shortness of breath, trouble getting up in the morning, trouble going to sleep, heart pounding and racing. There is a very high correlation between child care breakdown and these stress related problems. These parents are also more likely to feel more tension and less companionship, in their marriage, feel less effective as a parent and even feel less satisfied with life in general. A study that the National Council of Jewish Women conducted in 80 communities around the United States of women before and after giving birth found that women who had had to change their child care frequently felt much less happy with being a parent and satisfied with life in general.

All of these are critical issues in the United States. They are critical because we have a crisis. Just at the time when there is greater need for child care, there is less of it. There is less of it for a variety of reasons. First, we are experiencing severe labour shortages in the child care field. We are experiencing these problems before other industries, predominatly because child care has a lower status and because it is lower paid. We have the second highest turnover rate of any industry in the United States. Only people like gas station attendents, parking lot attendents and dishwashers leave the field more often than people who work in child care: 35.2% according to the latest figures. The average years in the field of child care are 2.7 years and 62% have been in the field less than 3 years. This compares with elementary school teachers who have been in the field on an average of 12.4 years. The primary reason is the low salaries. For an in-home child care provider the average salary in the United States is $94. That is below poverty level wages! A child care professional in a center has an average wage of $191, again below poverty level wages. Seventy per cent of people who work in child care earn below poverty level wages in the United States. Toronto is one of the places that we all look to because the city has provisions to improve the salaries of child care staff. We have four States that have done so in the United States and five States have legislation pending.

In comparing the salary of a child care teacher to a kindergarten teacher, often with the same educational qualifications, the teacher is likely to make $332 per week. Even though child care staff are low paid and voting with their feet by leaving the field, child care is expensive for families, particularly for the working poor. A family who pays for child care in the United States is likely to pay 10-25% of its family income on child care. It is comparable to housing and the poorer families have a greater percentage of their income paying for child care. Those are the problems that families have in terms of child care.

Elder care is an issue of growing importance in the United States. The population is aging and the surveys that have been done show that the average company has somewhere between 7-28% of its employees who are regularly taking care of elderly parents. Our latest figures on elder care from two surveys that we have done, one in a bank with 3,507 respondents, and the other in a pharmaceutical company of 1,902 respondents, found that 7% of the workers in the bank and 11% in the pharmaceutical company are taking care of elderly parents. When we ask how many of them expect to have elder care responsibilities within the next five years, it was 28% of the bank respondents and 44% of the

pharmaceutical company respondents. This is a problem that will be growing in importance. It will probably eclipse child care in the number of employees affected. The average amount of time that is spent taking care of an elderly person is longer by and large than that spent taking care of a child and it can be more traumatic, particularly if the person is ill. We found that 1/3 of the people in our sample were taking care of more than 1 person, sometimes as many as 3 people. One out of five employees were worrying about their elderly parents almost all the time or all the time while at work.

There are other aspects of difficulty for people balancing work and family life and I just want to briefly mention some of these because I think they are important. We tend to think of work/family equalling child care and that is not true at all. There are many other issues that employees struggle with in terms of work/family. One is the time and timing of their job, how many hours they work and how those hours are arranged and fit with family schedules and how they fit with community facilities. The survey that was done in *USA Today* said that the biggest issue for parents was feeling that they were missing out on the important moments in their child's life —the baseball game, taking their child to the doctor, etc. This is highly correlated with stress and stress-related health problems in our research.

Relocation is another issue. In our *Fortune Magazine* survey we found that 30% of the men and 26% of women had refused a new job, promotion or transfer because of family responsibilities.

There are also the more psychological aspects of people's jobs that make a difference. How demanding and hectic the job is, is highly correlated with physical illness as well as stress. How much autonomy one has on the job, how much say one has when problems come up, makes a difference also. It turns out that the most important factors relate to the relationships at work. We found this out in our very first study in which we had people respond to the question, "What one change would improve the quality of your family life and maintain or improve your productivity?" Most respondents said time flexibility but the second by employees was that they would like to have a boss who understood when they had a problem in managing work and family life.

That issue was revealed in a study we conducted in which we interviewed children. We asked children what one change could the company make that would improve their family life. We were working with the the union in that case. The children said they would like more time with their parents, but what they would really like is for their parents to come home less "wired". We said, "Wired?" The children then told us all about the office politics: so and so was being mean to their parents, so and so got hired who is a jerk, etc. We asked the parents if they told their children about their problems at work and some said they did but some said "No, I never bring problems home". However, their children knew all about the problems and they could tell what kind of day their parents had had by the way the parents turned the doorknob on the door, from the footsteps coming into the house and the way the coat got put down. The children had all sorts of coping devices to handle this. One child said, "I just go into the bathroom, turn on the bath water real loud and create a diversion and by the time I come out things have calmed down a bit". Some other children said, "We just pick a fight right away. We know we're going to have a fight sooner or later so we get it over with right away." Relationships at work do make a difference.

There has been a lot of research for a long time about how important the boss is in terms of physical and mental wellbeing. We started to look at a new dimension of this factor in terms of how supportive the boss is if there are work/family problems. We have conducted a lot of focus groups to develop what I think is really a smashing measure. We call it supervisor work/family support, and it assesses whether or not one's boss is flexible if there is a work/family problem, whether or not one's boss knows the policies that do exist, thinks the subject is legitimate at the workplace and applies the policies without favouritism. In fact, a lot of employees in the focus groups that we have conducted describe coming to the focus group as coming "out of the closet". One parent said, "I've never told anyone at work that I have children before". We find that if you have a boss who is supportive of you that you are more likely to be satisfied in your job, have lower stress and fewer stress-related health problems.

We have also started to look at the issue of the culture of the workplace. Again, we did a number of focus groups with employees to identify the components of a supportive workplace and have developed a measure. It asks questions like,

"At this company do you have to choose between your family life or advancing in your job", or, "If you have a family problem the attitude here is you made your bed now lie in it". What we find is that the type of culture of the workplace is even more predictive than a supportive boss.

What is being done by companies across the United States in response to this? I would like to go back in terms of the way I identified the problems and describe some of the solutions that I see. In terms of helping employees find child care there is Resource and Referral which is very deliberately named. It means not only help in finding child care but it also refers to improving the resources of the child care.

What companies have found is that if they provide a service to help parents find out about child care, for example, for their infants and there is no infant care in the community then they are really not providing a useful service. Resource & Referral agencies (about 1,000 companies around the United States now provide Resource and Referral) not only help parents find child care but they also improve the supply of child care. They look at the gaps in services. Probably the most frequently described Resource & Referral (R & R) Program was developed by IBM in 1984. Work/Family Directions, the company that has contracted with IBM for R & R, since its inception, increased the supply of child care by over 50,000 places. There are also some exciting collaberative efforts. For example, BankAmerica in California developed an initiative called The California Child Care Initiative to recruit and train new child care providers. Du Pont, in Willmington, Delaware, went to lobby in its State legislature to keep schools open before and after school.

There is also the issue of quality. Again Resource & Referral has been very important in improving quality of care in our country. It not only educates parents about what to look for, but they also do training for providers. Steelcase, for example, in Grand Rapids, Michigan, has programs where providers are trained.

Another issue companies have also begun to do is deal with the salary crisis in child care. The McKnight Foundation, the 3M Foundation in St. Paul has given a very large community-wide grant to improve salaries and to help manage their businesses better.

Another issue that companies have addressed is how to help employees pay for child care. Again, there are about 1500 companies that provide flexible spending accounts. With a flexible spending account, an employee can reduce his or her salary by up to $5,000 and pay for child care with pretax dollars. Companies are also offering a discount (an arrangement with a local child care program) by which they contribute 10% of the cost and the child care program will lower its fee by 10%. Also a few companies have vouchers, based on family income, whereby the company pays the child care fees on a sliding scale.

Most people think that when a company gets involved in child care, it is providing on-site child care. That, in fact, is one of the least frequently desired by employees and the least frequently done. I am not saying that where it does happen it is not wonderful and we do see a growth in this kind of corporate assistance lately, but it is not a thing that employees necessarily want and it is not necessarily the thing that companies want to do. There are about 600 (not counting the military) on or near-site child care programs in the United States. They are done in a variety of ways: There is, what I think of as the Hoffman-LaRoche model, a company owned and operated model. In fact, employees of the child care centre are employees of Hoffman-LaRoche and get comparable salaries and benefits. Then there is the Campbell Soup model which contracts out the service to Resources for Child Care Management. Then there is the World Bank or Merck model in which the company gives some money to a group of employees and says, "We don't want to be in the child care business, here is some start-up money, maybe some in-kind contributions". However, if the program is going to be high quality and have no subsidy then the higher paid employees are going to be able to take advantage of it and the lower paid employees are not.

There is also a growing development of consortium child care programs. There is one at Hartz Mountain Industries in New Jersey. Generally, these work best if there is a broker, an individual or group who help the companies come together and solve problems then these arrangements are more successful.

Companies are beginning to develop sick child care. This is one of the biggest issues that employees face: how to manage things when their children are sick. Companies have responded by sponsoring sick child care programs. There is one called Chicken Soup in Minneapolis.

Other wonderful names include Weasels & Sneezles, etc. Parents are often reluctant to take their child out to either a sick bay in a hospital or a sick child care program. However, once they do it, they tend to be quite satisfied with this arrangement. However, there seems to be resistance to taking children to a new place when they are ill.

3M and IDS have funded a health care facility to provide in-home sick child care. The companies pay a portion of the cost. Parents are already paying for regular child care so when children are sick that can be a real strain particularly for working poor families. At 3M for example, if the cost is $8 per hour they pay between $2 and $6 an hour of that cost. There is also an interest in helping child care programs set up their own sick bays. Parents really prefer to take their children to a known place.

There are several perceived obstacles to an expansion in employer-supported child care. In our surveys and a recent study by the American Society for Personnel Administration, employers have been asked, "What are the obstacles to company involvment?" One is cost. This, however, assumes that the company is going to provide an on-site child care program because other initiatives like flexible spending accounts or Resource & Referral, or even allowing your employees to stay at home when they are sick are low cost items. Thus, when companies say "cost is an obstacle", I always think that they do not have information about all the options.

Another obstacle that companies report is "equity". (i.e. You have to do the same thing for all employees.) There are several ways of looking at the equity issue. One way is to define 'child care' as 'dependent care' and you see more companies feeling comfortable with the issue in terms of not just looking at children but looking at elderly parents.

Another way that companies have dealt with the issue is by taking a life cycle approach. That is, you may only have 5-10% of employees using Resource & Referral, and that does not sound like a lot but if you look at it over the life cycle of the employees, 10% use it this year, 10% use it next year, 10% use it the following year and it accumulatively adds up.

A third approach is to ask employees. In our surveys we ask, "How would you feel about your company developing an initiative to help employees balance work and family life, even if it didn't directly benefit you?" What we find is that, on a scale of 1-5 where 5 is the most favourable, 90-95% of the employees say 5. There is only a very small minority, (2% or less) who are unfavourable. They are not the white males who did not have to struggle with this. Oddly enough they are the women who often said, "Hey, I managed this on my own, why should we help other people?"

If you are going to provide on-site child care then liability is seen as a major obstacle. In fact, liability insurance can be obtained from between $40-60 per child for half a million dollars worth of coverage, depending on the state or the area in which one does business. I know of no suits in a corporate-sponsored child care program in the United States. The average suit is of the trip-and-fall variety, less than $300 and if the insurer pays within 10 days, the number of claims go down 50%. So, liability insurance is obtainable, not that expensive, and if you ask any company who has on-site child care they will say that it is not really a problem, it is a smoke screen sort of an issue.

Then there is elder care. Companies are beginning to provide Resource & Referral information about where to go for all sorts of things from doctors to finding nursing homes and to information about specific illnesses.

There are also time policies. Flexible time is used by about 12% of workers in the United States. There is increasing corporate creativity with developing models of time flexibility. There is also permanent part-time work in which people can return to a full-time job, are taken seriously as employees and have pro-rated benefits. Companies have come up with some very innovative ways of designing flexible time policies. A children's clothing store developed a computer system to track peak hours and match their needs with those of employees. Banks have instituted "mothers' hours" and Pepsico has summer hours.

Then there is the issue of personal leave. When I have done focus groups at companies, the employers are always terrified that employees are going to march in and demand an on-site child care centre and in the 12 companies in which we conducted focus groups, that was never the first choice. The first thing people wanted was to be able to stay at home when their children were sick. They say we lie about it now and do it anyway but we really want to make it legitimate. Companies have begun to respond to that. For example,

Warner Lambert now makes it legitimate to stay home for 'family illness days' rather than 'personal illness days'. Becton Dickinson has a time bank — employees can take time off in 2-3 hour installments to go to their children's ballet performance, doctor or teacher conference for example. Hewlett Packard has pooled time off.

Some of you may have read about IBM's new parental leave program. There is now a 3-year leave for 'parental leave'. Employees must work part-time in the second and third year to keep up their skills. Generally, employees want time off for childbirth or adoption, with job protection, benefits continued, and with flexible return possible. If you ask new mothers what they want in surveys, they say they want to be able to have a gradual transition back to work.

Then there is help with relocation and help in coping with work and family life. About a thousand companies give seminars at the workplace. EAP's have begun to address work/family issues. There are caregiver fairs, in which companies will open up their lobbies and let all the agencies who provide help for children and families come in and employees can talk to people about child oriented dentists, pediatricians, summer camps, etc.

Then there are wellness programs. Johnson's and Johnson's Live for Life, for example, is a program that stresses prevention and wellness has begun to see work/family as a part of their mission.

There is supervisor training. A number of companies are beginning to train supervisors to be more flexible and more understanding and know how to cope with work/family problems. At Merck how understanding one is, is part of a supervisor's evaluation.

Then there are efforts to change the culture of the workplace. Signals will be sent out that now the company should be seen as a place that is supportive to work/family. There will be articles in the newsletter, there will be announcements by the CEO, there will be mission statements written, that say, "We believe that an employee's family life is important". Making the company "family-friendly" is what I call these efforts.

Now, how do these initiatives affect productivity? We have done very little research on this in the United States largely because companies who do provide programs know that they work and are not interested in evaluating them. It is the companies who are thinking about doing programs who want the research.

There have been three national surveys that have looked at the impact of work/family programs, particularly child care programs on productivity and assessing manager perception. In all three, there is a very high proportion that believe that these programs improve the company's ability to recruit and retain employees, to improve morale and to decrease absenteeism.

There is also the study that I told you about, that was done by the National Council of Jewish Women in the 80 communities. They developed a measure consisting of eight ways in which a company could be responsive to an employee who was having a baby. The measure included sick leave during pregnancy, disability leave, some wage replacement during disability leave, parental leave, insurance coverage, supportive supervisor and child care assistance. They grouped the employees who worked for the top 20% of accommodating companies and compared them to the employees who worked at the bottom 20% of accommodating companies. They found that the employees who worked for more accommodating companies seemed to give back more to their companies. They took fewer sick days, they were sick less often, they worked later into their pregnancies, they worked more on their own time and they were more likely to come back after having the baby. Some companies have the attitude "If you give them an inch they'll take a mile", that is, employees will abuse the greater flexibility and support of work/family initiatives. This study indicates the reverse; employees are reciprocal in more accommodating companies.

How a company figures out what to do is a really important issue: companies have to ask what the problem is in their work force before deciding what to do. With the companies that I have worked for I always ask the human resource or personnel people, "What do you think employees are going to say?" Then we do a survey or focus groups to find out. Frequently, what the company thought that the employees wanted was not what employees in fact did want. It is very important to ask the question of what are the problems before posing the solution(s).

There are a number of steps in this process. First, there is an assessment of employee need — for example, a survey, focus

groups, task group, etc. Then companies conduct what I think of as a competitive analysis. That is, they investigate what other similar companies have done to address these problems and what has worked and what has not worked in what they have done. This is important in avoiding mistakes. Third, companies determine what they are willing to do and in doing so, assess the way that they usually solve problems like this. Finally, companies investigate the resources in their communities. You may think that your employees need infant care and you do not want to develop an infant care program but there may be one down the road that is struggling financially and with a little gift from your foundation, or with Resource & Referral, employees could find out that it is there.

What are the trends in the United States? There has been a huge increase in interest in this subject in the United States. It is associated, to some degree, with the issue of labour shortages. *Business Week*, for example, ran a cover story on September 19 that talked about human capital. I have seen the interest in this subject shift from an interest in employee productivity per se and the problems caused by lack of child care to an interest in the future workforce. There is much greater attention to what is happening to children, not just how we can find someone to watch them so their parents can go to work but what is the quality of those experiences that children are receiving? The *Business Week* story states, "The nation's ability to compete is threatened by our inadequate investment in our most important resource, people. Put simply, too many workers lack the skills to perform more demanding jobs and as the economy comes to depend more and more on women and minorities we face a massive job of education and training starting before kindergarten. Can we afford it? We have no choice."

The Committee for Economic Development, a prestigous group of company presidents in the United States had the task of looking at what to do about productivity and they started with technological issues but ended up by concluding that the most important investment the United States could make in productivity was to invest in the early care and education of its most 'at risk' children. A surprising result I thought, from a group of business executives. This has meant that there is a growing interest in young children. In my view we have moved now in the work/family issue from Phase 1 in the United States to Phase 2.

In Phase I there was a dawning awareness that work/family problems exist. The companies were beginning to identify the problems and to slot in solutions. There were the beginnings of partnerships, companies would get together to talk about the problems and the solutions. It was a piecemeal approach.

Phase II has several characteristics. The first is that a much wider range of companies are involved. It is not the trend setters anymore. As one company said to us in the *Fortune* survey that we did, "We're not the trend setters we're the fast followers." Someone else said, "We wait until its tried and true and proven and safe and foolproof before we get involved". That is starting to happen; it is the mainstream companies now not just the pioneering companies who are getting involved.

The American Society for Personnel Administration surveyed its small, mid-sized and large member companies. Fifty per cent reported that they planned to do something to help employees with child care in the coming years. In the survey that we just did for *Fortune Magazine*, 86% of the companies said that they were going to develop new initiatives. I see this issue as a wave that is beginning to crest.

The second characteristic of Phase II is that there is a focus on the quality of what is happening to children and child care.

The third characteristic is that no longer are companies acting alone to solve problems. There is the beginning of real partnerships. For example, in Linn-Benton Counties, Oregon, there was a community-wide needs assessment and the companies are getting together to develop some community solutions. In San Francisco, companies have joined One Small Step: each company does something to improve child care in San Francisco. In Minneapolis a group spearheaded by the United Way and headed by the President of Honeywell, called Success by Six, have a community task force made up of government, industry and the social service sector to look at the obstacles to children entering first grade as a success rather than as a failure. They are going to develop a series of recommendations and implement them in their community to make sure that children are "successes by six".

The fourth characteristic of Phase II is that the pioneering companies have moved to a different level of involvement reflecting six characteristics:

1. The CEO supports work/family for business reasons. It is seen as a legitimate company area.

2. There is now a person in charge. It is not something a person does out of his or her back pocket. There is now a job that is called being the Director of Work/Family Programs, or V.P. for Work/Family, etc. It is a legitimate job.

3. Different areas of company functioning are looked at together; companies do not just develop a benefits program, or a training program for supervisors or a personal leave policy, but investigate how these programs interact with each other to affect the culture.

4. Companies are trying to change their cultures to be more family-friendly.

5. The pioneering companies are reviewing their policies to see whether they really are family-friendly or not.

6. There is an emphasis now on time flexibility, that is how to provide real time flexibility and to encourage supervisors to be more supportive of work/family problems.

The government is also beginning to get involved. Parental leave legislation finally made it to the floor of the Senate but was not passed this past year. Next year I think that there will be a push toward temporary disability insurance so that people can have wage replacement during disability leave. There are five States that now have it and I think that that is what Congress is going to develop. But there are six States that have passed Parental Leave legislation. We are, in fact, doing a study on the impact of such legislation on employers and employees.

In child care we have managed to create a momentum in Congress. A survey recently conducted shows that only 2.5% of the members of Congress think we should do *nothing* about child care. In other words, 97% think that Congress has got to do something about child care. That is raising a huge debate in the United States: Who are we talking about? Are we talking about at-risk children or are we talking about all children? Who should pay for it? What ages should we focus on? Should we focus on preschoolers or should we start with parent education and infant/toddler care? Should we have part-day programs or full-day programs? What relationship should the government and the private sector have in paying for these? Through what funding mechanisms? Do we pull all the funding mechanisms together or do we create new ones, or do we fund old ones? How are we going to define quality, are there going to be national standards and how do we ensure quality? Is there going to be training and are we going to improve salaries?

It is a very exciting time in the United States to be in this field. Things are happening. We have been working in this field now for a long time but it looks like the issue has become a much more central one in business functioning. I wish you a wonderful conference and an exciting day and look forward to talking to you more during the course of the day.

Ellen Galinsky is Director of Work and Family Studies, Bank Street College, New York. In July 1989, she is co-founding the Families and Work Institute also in New York City - a national clearing house of information and it also conducts policy research on work and family.

RESPONSE TO ELLEN GALINSKY THE CANADIAN CONTEXT

Kathy Gallagher Ross

We are fortunate indeed to have the chance to view the current work and family situation in the United States from Ellen's knowledgeable point of view. While many policies and programs that Ellen Galinsky has referred to are applicable to our Canadian context, some of the conditions and variables are quite different, particularly as they apply to the role of government. I would like to discuss this later in my response.

This conference has been organized to try and identify, clarify, and plan approaches to resolving work and family conflicts. The challenge is to establish a new consensus involving employees, employers, government and labour as a basis for change. There is always the temptation in order to respond quickly to specific problems, to settle for 'quick fix' and sometimes simplistic solutions. For example, obviously, parents at work cannot care for their own children yet young children need care. Therefore, a simplistic solution is, that all working parents should be provided with child care. A more holistic approach to the need for care is to recognize that while all families do need help and support with child care, some might choose full-time group care whilst others might opt for extended parental leave with or without pay and benefits with guaranteed re-entry into the labour force.

Still, others might prefer a combination, and there are many combinations and permutations that can work for people. Many of us who are concerned with establishing a balanced integration of work and family believe that, wherever possible, the primacy of family members as the major decision-makers for themselves will be established as a non-negotiable principle in any government or corporate policy or practice.

I believe the issue of choice is a crucial one. When people are able to make choices and decisions for and with their families their sense of autonomy and self-worth are greatly enhanced. A great deal of research has been devoted to showing how a parents' feelings of autonomy and sense of efficacy directly affect his/her parenting and how directly this affects the child.

Another example is the day care research which indicates that a parents' decison-making around choice of care positively affects the quality of that setting for the child and his/her family. Some people address this concept of choice by using the operative term 'empowerment'. Empowerment often refers to recipients of social services, for example, organizing to exert more control over their lives as a result of problematic or unresponsiveness on the part of social services.

Empowerment, as it is often discussed, usually means giving back or taking back something which has been lost. Another way of looking at empowerment is to ensure that people have an opportunity to define the nature of their own needs at the outset and make a meaningful contribution to defining their own options. Such an approach makes empowerment redundant.

This raises the question, to what extent are all of those concerned in work and family — labour, business and government prepared to facilitate the decision-making process through which employees will define their own needs and goals? There are very few opportunities for unique, long-term and intimate relationships left to us, outside the family, in our society. The preservation of that uniqueness involves respect for the rights of family members to shape their relationships in the ways they find most appropriate. Essentially, work and family refers to many different aspects of dependent care, although that phrase 'dependent care' always gives me pause, because to me, dependent care almost sounds like burdensome care and I think of dependent care as interdependent care.

Parents have as strong a need for their children as their children do of them and this seems to apply across the lifespan. Cuddling, rocking and talking to a delicious little 8 month old baby is certainly a case study in mutual need and reciprocity. So is the satisfaction that comes from helping an elderly parent cope with aging or illness, or building a strong partner relationship with a spouse or other family member. These interactions make up the very life of our lives, so to speak, and it is thus really crucial that we expect families will be able to define their own ways of being together.

Because families do respond in their own ways, dependent care also includes leave, alternative work arrangements and other

innovative ways of working. Ellen has outlined some of the practical ways that these different kinds of programs have been implemented in the U.S.

The partnerships approach to work and family is, I believe, a very hopeful one. If we can involve all the players it may be possible to create many different policies and practices which are truly responsive to families. Our recent Federal election clearly established that most Canadians consider social policy and programs a non-negotiable part of the fabric of our society. Canadians are comfortable with the idea that Government has a critical role to play in assuming leadership in the social policy arena and in defining the public interest.

While government can focus attention on issues of public concern like work and family and provide incentives and direction, new partnerships must involve solutions based on consensus and consultation with all the members of these partnerships. There is a growing body of research which links increased workplace productivity and personnel policies which address work and family conflicts. Many business leaders are expressing their interest in these policies. Government has also identified work and family as an important issue for the coming years.

Some unions have raised work and family issues at the bargaining table and are continuing to do so. It goes without saying that employees have a vital stake in resolving work and family issues. In other words, all the players are in place, and it seems now is the time to take advantage of the very real momentum that we are feeling here in Canada and work out a more effective integration of work and family for Canadian families and, consequently, for Canadian employers.

We have attempted to provide a 'cafeteria style' program for the conference which offers you a variety of approaches and case studies. We have approached the conference with the idea that we are all learning and we need to discuss, participate and share. It is my hope this process of learning and discussing during the conference will help to forge the necessary new consensus I spoke of earlier and help point the way ahead. Thank you very much.

Kathy Gallagher Ross, Conference Chair

CHILD CARE AND CORPORATE PRODUCTIVITY

Dr. John Fernandez

I have just completed a study on 30 companies, representing the areas of high technology, finance, real estate, etc. These are representative of Corporate America. Overall, about 30,000 people participated in the study.

This survey did not just focus on the attitudes toward child care or child care problems or work/family problems. It focussed on careers, how the employees perceived their company valuing them, training activities, health activities, etc.

It is clear when we asked employees about missing work that parental and childhood status does have an impact on whether employees have or have not missed work. Approximately 2 out of 5 women,and 3 out of 10 men have missed work in the past year. Women in almost every parental and childhood category missed work more than men. While men in America are beginning to take on increasing responsibilities for providing child care and dealing with work and family issues, it is still primarily a woman's issue.

There is a scenario in the telecommunications area that the public all want operators when they need them. Well, if an operator misses work because of work and family issues, the person has to be replaced and still be paid. Sometimes, they have to be paid as much as time and one-half to two and one-half times the normal pay rate, depending on the day of the week or the hours. So, it does not take much to have a few missed days of work of employees for that to begin to add up in big dollars for the corporation.

There are very few employees who do not deal with personal and family related issues during working hours. You have all heard about the 3 o'clock syndrome in America when children are home from school and parents will telephone them. In America there are something over 11 million latch-key children. One study found that 24% of the fires caused in homes in America are caused by latch-key children. Lots of those children get hurt.

We asked the employees a series of twelve questions about the problems they face, such as care of sick children, school conferences, doctor and dentist appointments, balancing work and family conflicts, sudden loss of child care, finding quality child care, etc. What we found when we put those questions into an index is that only 24% of the women with children 18 and under and 45% of the men have no problems in those areas. Forty-five per cent of the women have problems in at least 5 of the 12 areas. Also, 1 in 4 men have problems in those areas. Obviously, those problems lead to stress.

Fifty-four percent of the single women, 54% of married women with dependent children and 58% of unmarried couples with dependent children have stress on the job because of work and family conflicts. Essentially, as a mother and married, the stress level in many cases is just like that of single women who have children. In other words, the husband is not playing much of a role in helping with child care and work and family conflicts.

Not only is there stress on the job but, also, stress at home. In a study I did for my book on Child Care and Corporate Productivity, we found that there is a slightly higher percentage of employees who say they have more stress at home than on the job. This finding also occurred in the study we are currently discussing.

This all leads, in part, to the conclusion that if there are child care problems, there is stress, and there will also be health-problems — all of these impact on the employee's ability to do their job as effectively as possible. We asked the employees, to what extent do your child care problems impact on your work effectiveness?

One area that corporations do not understand where their productivity is being impacted, is the high percentage of people not accepting a transfer or promotion because of work and family issues.

Ten percent of the women and 4% of the men said they would consider quitting their job because of child care problems. When there is control for age of the children, the percentage of women increases dramatically and the percentage for men increases a little. There are also those employees who would quit the company to go to another company because they perceived the company had better child care. This number is lower than the number I got in 1984/85. I suspect there has been a lot of talk and frustration among corporate employees who thought in 1984 that companies were going to do progressive things in the child care area, just as many of us thought the parental bill in Congress

would pass in an election year; it did not happen. There is less optimism now.

Twenty-seven percent of women and 4% of the men have considered quitting their jobs to stay home with their children. Interestingly, 30% of women and 22% of men said they would turn down a promotion if it was going to have an impact on their ability to care for their child or if it was going to create even more problems for them. Forty-eight percent of women and 39% of men said they would turn down transfers under the same circumstances.

The demographics within the United States show there is a baby "bust", and of this generation a higher percentage are made up of minorities with overall lower educational levels than the so-called majority. Our school system is being critically looked at and there are many people who have problems with it. Because of the "bust" there is an increasing need to keep and retain the best people. In America today, if you have a job selling clothes, they are not going to tell you they are going to pay you $3.35 per hour, minimun wage, and no benefits, as they would have three years ago. What they are doing now is paying $6-7 per hour, and allowing for part-time work and benefits. We are finding it extremely difficult to find people in computer programming, engineering, clerical jobs, etc.

So, as we go into the future with labour shortages, etc. companies are going to respond much more to the fact that they cannot afford good people leaving their company, turning down transfers, etc. They cannot afford people not accepting promotions. These numbers, I suggest, will increase in part because people are saying that work is not everything in their lives. There are some value changes going on in America.

Over the years, when we asked the question concerning whether or not an employer should play an active role in assisting employees with their work and family issues, which includes elder care concerns, an extremely high percentage of both men and women said yes.

When I control for the race, gender and level of the employees, I still find in this study that the group that is most opposed to doing anything in this area are the higher level white males. I still think there is a lot of work that has to be done in the area of convincing those people who have made it in Corporate America, and primarily they are white males, to change their views and perceptions.

We asked these employees in the survey what would be the most useful thing in helping them resolve their child care problems. The most important thing that the employees cite is "flex time". They want to be able to have real flex time. Flex time is not where the boss is in at 7:00 a.m. and leaves at 7:00 p.m., and if employees want to, they can flex before 7:00 a.m.and after 7:00 p.m. It is a very crucial thing. In one company I am familiar with, there were a number of women who had made it to a relatively high level, and they had certain constraints due to their child care problems. There was not a very sympathetic ear there. Even though their bosses said they could have flex time, there was always an important meeting at 5:00 p.m. — the time they had to pick up their child(ren).

The second most important choice to employees was flex place. With the new technology today, it is very easy for people to work at home and communicate with the office. There are fax machines, telephone, computer terminals, modems, etc.

The third choice was day care centers, not "family care", which many Resource and Referral organizations claim are most desired by employees. There are more stories coming out about family care and how terrible it is in some cases in America. More and more employees are saying (at least to me, and in my surveys) that "we prefer the company to get involved and help in establishing day care centers because we know the quality is going to be better." Additionally, if the companies are involved and supportive, it often means the people who are working there will probably be better paid. One of the biggest disgraces in America is the amount of money we pay to the people who care for our most precious "possessions", our children. There are some companies which have got their insurance companies to provide benefits for the employees of the day care centers at a low cost.

The fourth choice is financial assistance, which includes voucher systems, flexible benefits, payroll deductions for child care, etc. What this indicates is that employees are saying, "We need some financial help", whether it is in the form of tax deductions, volunteer systems, or flexible benefits.

Our respondents considered flexible benefits to be very important, but they are often opposed. "It's a nightmare, it's going to cost more, it's going to be

unfair to certain employees or,this plan has worked for me over the years —why should we change it now". What they are not recognizing is that they have an increasingly diverse workforce that has different needs. How to get this changed I am not certain, except to get some of those companies to recognize that there are companies in America that do have flexible benefit plans and their employees are very satisfied.

What companies are going to have to do to attract and retain good employees in the future is to be more flexible toward their employees. I would suggest that one of the reasons for increased flexibility will be because there will be such a thing as portable pensions. In the past 23 years only 6 laws have been introduced into Congress on portable pensions. Last year, in one year alone, 7 bills were introduced. Portable pensions can be described by this example: after 15 years with AT&T I could have left and taken my pension to IBM. Now I must wait until I am 65 to get any pension from AT&T. Once employees are able to carry their pensions with them, they are not going to stay with a company who is not dealing with their personal needs. Many people stay with their companies not because they want to stay, but because they feel hooked. They have too much invested in it.

Employees have noted situations that were the least useful to them in solving their problems. Part-time work is one. Employees said basically they cannot afford to work part-time, that is not what they want. A lot of them also said that "If I worked part-time my career would be over." If I correlate all the problems that the employees have on child care problems with questions concerning whether or not they want a career, if they go after their own training and development, etc., the answer is that a higher percentage of employees who have child care problems are more motivated to have a career than those who do not. Recognizing that women have the most child care problems, these facts contradict the stereotype held by a significant minority of people who do not believe women are even interested in a professional career.

The next area employees found least helpful was resource and referral. We went back and asked them to explain this answer, as many companies do resource and referral. There was skepticism. I think what people really focus on is the referral part of it. They have not seen the success of people like Work/Family Directions in increasing the supply of quality child care. There is a good percentage of employees who are now using the R & R, and that is probably why they say that it is not useful to them because they already have it.

In America, 30% of employees today are responsible for elderly individuals. Of the 30,000 employees in the study only 8%, (9% women and 8% men) were responsible for elderly individuals. However, controlling for age of the employees, figures are as high as 17% for people who are 50 years of age. It is really crucial to remember that America is becoming a society of elderly. Not only that, but our family structure, the number of children in the family are fewer. Many of the baby boomers are having only 2 children thus there will be only 2 children to take care of the aging parents. In the near future there will be a higher percentage of employees saying that they are having a difficult time dealing with the elderly..

I firmly believe that the United States is not moving ahead on child care issues in large part because of our views about women in the workforce. In this study that I did, only 24% of the men and 35% of the women did not agree with any of the stereotypes about women. If you take that and correlate it with those people who believe a company should be actively involved in doing things in the child care and work and family area, you see there is a very high correlation.

Forty-nine percent of the men and 29% of the women in our studies state that women's employment is the cause of the breakdown of the American family. If a person believes that women working leads to a breakdown of the American family, that person does not want the company to do anything to help the women and their family. So, the question of where women are in society and what their role should be is a crucial one. While 98% of our new Congress are saying that they are supportive of child care, I will suggest to you that Americans will move very slowly forward. We have to be a big enough country to pass the Equal Rights Amendment which says that women are equal to men. We will not do that. The makeup of the higher levels of Corporate America have to change and are changing. For example, a department head recently said, "Look, I didn't have much problem with understanding sexism and didn't realize it existed until I had 2 daughters who went to work. I think this company is a wonderful place, but when my daughters come home and tell me what is happening to them I am

appalled and if I didn't have those daughters I would be standing here and saying what some of you are saying, that there is no problem".

That is also happening with child care. As some of these older executives have daughters and sons who have children and they see they are having difficulty and it is impacting on their careers executives start talking about doing something, but that is a big leap for them, a very, very big leap.

In these companies 59% of the men and 33% of the women say that women only get their jobs because they are women. If I believe the only reason women have jobs is because they are a woman do you think I would be sympathetic about child care issues?

Fifty-five percent of the men and 25% of the women state that women lower the hiring promotion standards of the company. Forty percent of the men and 23% of the women state women use their gender as an alibi. Twenty-four percent of the men vs 20% of the women state women are not serious about careers. Fourteen percent of the men and 7% of the women state women are too emotional to be effective managers. Anyone who has even one of those values will come up with all kinds of reasons why they should not do things in the child care and work/family areas. I had a nice big office as a Division Operations Manager. My first levels and clerks were stuffed into little corners and no one said that was an equity issue. It is interesting we do not want to bring up equity issues when we feel it will interfere with some of the things we have.

Most companies have EAP programs that deal with people who are alcoholics. That only affects 10% of the workforce. We do know that child care issues affect at least 50% of the workforce and that work and family issues affect everyone in the workforce. Yet they say they do not want to do things in this area because it is not equitable. Corporations say they cannot do things because of the unions or liabilities. I am one of the people who believe employers should not negotiate with unions on work and family issues. I believe you should work with the unions and go in partnership on solving them, but I do not believe that you negotiate these issues. The reason for addressing work and family issues is because they are productivity issues.

One of the things that has happened in the American family is that married women are going to have to make certain that good old hubby remembers he had something to do with those children once they are born. So, part of changing things in the American fabric is what women do and what they put up with in their own family structure.

One of the most important ways of impacting on improving the stress level and the problems that employees are having, is to educate managers to deal more effectively with work and family issues and to educate employees to respect and understand that women are equal to men.

Training is crucial. In my studies, if there is a supportive boss, then there are less missed days at work, less stress and so on. But, they are not going to be a supportive boss if they have sexist views, so you have to work on this.

All of these child care problems that employees have create stress at home. Women with younger children have more stress than those who have older children. The same thing applies to men. If there is stress at home or on the job, it does lead to missing more days at work, because you have problems getting up, going to sleep, etc.

Those people (36% of the women and 57% of the men) who say that they have a great deal of stress on the job because of work and family conflicts, said they miss work. But on the other hand, those employees (75% of the women and 83% of the men) who say they do not have any stress on the job because of work and family conflict have not missed work in the past year. So, stress does lead to people missing more work.

Stress also leads to health problems. For those employees who have a great deal of stress at home, 75% of the women and 60% of the men say that they have a difficult time getting up in the morning. On the other end of the scale, of those who say they do not have any stress, 43% of the women and 26% of the men say they have a difficult time getting up in the morning. So, child care problems or family problems lead to stress which leads to missed days at work as well as health problems.

We asked the employees if they were performing their job as effectively as possible. Of those employees who say they are performing their jobs as effectively as possible, only 37% of them said they have a difficult time getting up in the morning vs 58% of them who say they never have a difficult time getting up.

There are about 12 questions we have with regard to health problems and on every one of them there is an extremely high correlation. In the United States there is great concern about health care costs. One of the things I am going to emphasize in my new book is that helping employees with work and family issues not only increases your productivity, it will also help those exorbitant health costs that affect the bottom line.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS POSED BY PARTICIPANTS:

1. Most Americans will spend $25,000 to send their children to Harvard, so they can run around and tell you "My kids are in Harvard". Yet we know by the time their child goes to Harvard, that the impact we can have on their learning and values is less than when they are younger. When you tell these same parents who can afford the $25,000, that they have to spend $100 per week to cater to their infant child who needs more attention and care, they are often unwilling to spend that amount. There is a value system gap that exists within our society. If the younger children are not helped to have a healthy, prosperous childhood, society as a whole will likely pay for it down the line.

2. The cost of child care and placing a dollar value on it is difficult to do because in an organization of 50 people there are going to be a lot of different needs in the child care, work/family area. How do you put a value on that? I am not certain how to measure that. Forming a control group of employees who are in the centre and a control group who is not and measuring them over a number of years might give you some answer but most companies do not want to do that because they say it is too costly.

I think, to do some of these creative things in the child care area, they should have follow-up research behind them. While there is a lot of talk and a lot of enthusiasm about what is going to go on, there are over 4,000 companies in the United States doing something with child care, work/family, but we have 6 million corporations.

How do you measure the cost of child care if you want to get your companies to lobby the local school districts to have before and after school care?

3. I urge you to go back and get your companies to start doing seminars and start changing their culture. At Bell of Pennsylvania, I had 1,500 people working for me. My people did not need flex time because we created an atmosphere that if you had to do something we respected you and did not think you were going to screw the company. My productivity, when I managed these 1,500 people, was the highest in the Bell system in a number of areas and it is because people liked and respected and enjoyed coming to work. Not all of them! But a significant enough number to have an impact on my results. How much does flex time cost you? I do not know how much it costs. It is difficult to determine.

4. I think it is disgusting the pay that child care providers get for taking care of our precious little children. Corporate support for adequate wages can help here. They spend all this money buying them little clothes and fixing up their rooms and have their pictures to show everyone. Then you have a child care provider who works 12 months out of the year, with no vacation time (if they take it they do not get paid for it), and no health care, etc. Yet people want top quality care for their children. They are going to have to pay for it and I suggest that government has to get involved in this. In the United States we have to stop spending those billions and billions of dollars building bombs, trying to outdo the Russians. Imagine what those dollars would do to help our children, so that they can become assets to society rather than liabilities.

Corporations should establish their own day care centres or support the ones in the community. They can make certain they have adequate wages and they have good people there. This will impact on employees because they know their children are going to good day care centres with good staff. They are not going to be worried about their children but rather they are going to be doing their job.

5. If people are going to have children, they have to plan a bit more. I see too many people spending too much money on things other than their children and complaining about it. I think if you have a child you have to understand there are certain responsibilities and that is part of our development and understanding of our culture. I also believe, on the other hand, that the government should help because those children are going to be assets to society. I also believe that corporations can, for those employees who cannot afford it, help subsidize too. I see it coming from all three areas. Also, remember for a lot of these

children good quality day care will be the only quality care they will ever get. We have 11 million abused children in the United States.

6. At AT&T there are 320,000 employees. Approximately 260 are in North Dakota. There are 40,000-50,000 in New Jersey. The types of things we offer those employees would have to differ. An on-site or near-site centre at AT&T headquarters might be one thing to do, whereas Resource and Referral would be more applicable in North Dakota. Nothing in life is equitable so let us not make this an equity issue.

7. AT&T is moving slowly, but moving ahead. It is a big company and it takes time. They are considering doing Resource and Referral next year. We will be sitting down to look at what they are going to get out of Resource & Referral because it is not cheap. AT&T recognizes it needs a multiple approach because of different needs of the people. There are parts of AT&T which have flex-time. Part-time work has become much more acceptable. I left AT&T, but I am hired as a consultant for a certain number of days because that was a relationship we wanted to work out. So, I think there is going to be more and different types of work relationships worked out to give people the freedom to do those things that they really want to do in life.

Dr. John Fernandez is a private management consultant on Work/Family Issues in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS IN WORK AND FAMILY

Brigitte Kitchen

What I want to do today is to give you an overview of the child care programs existing in four European countries: Britain, France, West Germany and Sweden. Child care has a larger meaning in these countries than in Canada and incorporates financial provisions for children too young for institutional child care. In this sense, these cash provisions have to be seen as an alternative form of child care since they give parents the opportunity to take care of very young children themselves.

INSTITUTIONAL CHILD CARE

It is a surprise to most Canadians to discover that it is a lot easier for European parents to find child care. The reason for this is mainly because there are publically provided child care services for children from the age of two in France and from the age of three in Britain and Germany. In Sweden public child care is available for children as young as six months up to the age of seven, which is the school entry age for Swedish children. The Swedish system is an independent preschool chid care system run by the state which subsidizes 90% of the almost $10,000 a year it costs to keep a child in day care.

The German kindergarten is a different type of child care provision. A great number of kindergartens are run by religious institutions, parishes or by private voluntary organizations. Like in Sweden they are financed by the state. Both West Germany and Sweden place strong emphasis on preschool education. The kindergarten is definitely more than just a place to park one's children. The same goes for France. The Ecoles Maternelles again stress the educational and developmental needs of children.

In Britain child care provisions for infant and preschool children are problematic. Extensive use is made of so-called child minders for that age group. The child minders programs have received negative assessments by child development experts who would love to put an end to unsupervised child minding arrangements. But this is seen as out of the question as an alternative public program would be too expensive and, therefore, politically unacceptable in the present political climate dominated by Thatcherism.

The Germans interestingly enough use child care arrangements provided by private child minders hardly at all. Those that do exist have to be licensed and are state supervised. A parent can make a child care arrangement with a neighbour but the neighbour then has to apply for a license and accept supervision by a family child care supervisor who has to have an Early Childhood Education degree and who supervises up to 40 families. The supervised homes are not supposed to accept more than three children for care. Parents placing their children in unlicensed, unsupervised homes do not receive a state subsidy for their child care costs. If parents choose such a home, they have to pay for it themselves.

When we examine what perceptions inspire the child care provisions in these countries, we find two positions reflecting the social position of women. Britain, France and West Germany look at women in the work force mainly as wives and mothers holding down a job. The emphasis in these countries is still that the mother is the primary child care provider. They are, therefore, strongly committed to the principle of allowing women a choice to remain in the home or join the workforce. Sweden is different in this respect. Swedes look at a woman in the work force as a person with a job who has a family. They also stress the social importance of parenthood. They talk less about mother and father and more about "parents". Swedish public policy recognizes the necessity for provisions and facilities that allow both parents to combine their work responsibilities in the labour market with their responsibilities towards their families.

Why is there such a difference in the perception of the social position of women in these countries? The difference is partly historical and partly dictated by demographic factors and labour market needs. In France and West Germany family law is based on Roman law which has a strong patriarchal orientation. This means, that in the case of family break-up or divorce, the rights of children are given considerably more consideration than under Canadian statute law originating from English common law. For instance, in the splitting up of assets and properties among former spouses, the material well-being of children is protected. The objective in the determination of spousal and child support orders

is to prevent children from having to suffer a significant decline in the standard of living which they had enjoyed when their parents had been together. When it comes to child care, the patriarchal orientation of social policy in France and West Germany favours provisions that allow female parents, including those from low income families, to stay home and take care of young children.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

To make this possible the French used to pay a special benefit to one-income families which they called, appropriately, "salaire unique" = one income. It was paid in addition to a generous, universal family allowance program. It was income tested to enable low income parents to use it as a child care allowance to compensate parents who had given up paid work to take care of a child. As such it has to be understood as part of the French child care system. The name of the program has been changed because feminists felt that it placed too much emphasis on making women responsible for the child care of children under the age of two. After the age of two, the Ecoles Maternelles are available as an alternative to parental care. While the name of the program has been changed to "supplementary family allowance" its purpose has not. It is still to financially enable a parent to stay home with a child under the age of two.

The Germans have introduced a similar provision. They thought by using a name that would disguise the purpose of the program, feminist criticism could be avoided. Their so-called "education grant" for a child under the age of two allows a parent of either sex to drop out of the work force for one year to take care of the child. A parent receiving social assistance also qualifies for the education grant for the same period of time. The grant amounts to 600 marks a month which is double the amount of the going social assistance rate for a single individual. In addition to the education grant, parents receive a universal, tax free monthly family allowance of 50 marks for the first child, 100 marks for the second child, 220 marks for the third child and 240 marks for a fourth and any subsequent child. British child benefits are the result of the eliminataion of the tax exemption for dependent children. The additional tax revenue received was added to the existing funds allocated for the payment of family allowances which were substantially increased and payed to mothers as a tax-free child benefit. This form of intra-familial distribution of income has been described as "robbing the wallet to pay the purse". The Thatcher government, despite its record of stringent cuts in social spending, has decided to maintain the child benefit as a universal provision. It has thus re-affirmed the tradition of British social policy to give financial support to those who bear the extra responsibility of bringing up children.

France also increases family allowances by number of children. In that country there is a substantial increase in the universal tax-free family allowance for the third child. The reason for this increase in family allowances for the third child is demographic. Most European countries have low birth rates which are either below the current population size replacement level or just at the replacement level. The low birth rate is a policy concern which is not yet in Canada. So the demographic message in France and West Germany is to encourage parents to have a third child to maintain the population at its present size. Two children will only replace the actual parents but will not replace persons who remain childless.

Belgium is another example where demographic reasons prompted citizen action to take steps to improve the material circumstances of parents and children. This country has a large parent association which has become a powerful social policy advocacy group. The association was formed in the 1950's in response to a labour market shortage. At that time France had a much better child benefit package which lured Belgian French-speaking workers to France. This caused concern because Belgium is a bilingual country; if too many of the French speaking population were to emigrate to France, the demographic composition of Belgium would shift. Belgian parents organized a grass roots movement to gain at least the same kind of child benefits as in France. They succeeded in achieving even more generous cash benefits than in France, but not the child care provisions.

I have stressed the importance of family allowances because they have to be seen as a crucial component of the whole child benefit package, which is a blend of cash benefits and child care provisions that exists in these countries. Family allowances are seen very much as a form of additional income that goes to the family but not necessarily into the hand of the mother. The British social policy tradition, which Canada followed, is to pay state-financed family allowances to the

mother. The French and Belgians' with their strong patriarchal tradition, grounded in Roman law, do not single out the mother as the recipient of the allowances which,in these two countries,are financed from employer contributions. Thus, the standard way of delivering family allowances is through the pay package of the father. It is paid to the mother in the case of a single parent or if it is particularly requested. In France the supplementary family allowance benefit which was once available only to the mother is now also available to fathers. As long as the benefit was restricted to women it was open to the attack that it was really meant as a lure for women to stay home.

The German experience with the education grant paid for one year has had some very interesting implications for the relationship between women and men in marriage. Germany has one of the most generous maternity leave policies among Western industrialized countries. Mothers are eligible for seven and a half months of maternity leave. One month is to be taken before the delivery of the child and six months afterwards. The remaining half months can be taken before or after the birth of the child.

The German state pays 775 marks for a woman on maternity leave. If her earnings are more, her employer has to make up the difference between the maternity benefit and her regular income since she is not to be penalized for the fact that she has had a child. But what does that have to do with the education grant? The education grant can be paid right from the day the child was born. This means there are now two overlapping income support programs in place but women are only eligible for one.

Since the education grant pays less money than the maternity benefit, women, particularly those with higher income levels, will choose to remain on maternity benefits. But while the wife is on maternity benefit, the husband can actually apply for the education grant. The German government has linked this particular program deliberately to encourage men to share in child care. They seem to be saying: "Hey, guys, this is a way you can become involved in child raising and you are actually doing yourself a favour by getting paid for it". The result has been that, despite the misgivings of some feminists when the program was brought in that it was a ploy to keeping women out of the work force, more men than expected have actually taken advantage of the program.
The education grant becomes income related after it has been received for seven months. During the period of payment both parents can switch in and out of the work force, whenever they want but the grant cannot be paid to both of them at the same time.

FAMILY BENEFITS AND POVERTY

Most of the European countries are able to use their child benefit package to actually control the number of families with children living in poverty. A single parent with children in Sweden is less likely to be poor by our definition than is a married couple with two or more children in Canada. To keep parents out of poverty is achieved through well-targeted family allowances, i.e., generous universal benefits and a highly progressive tax system and other tax transfer benefits which reduce the risk of poverty. Family poverty in 1983 in West Germany was 5.2%, in Sweden 5.4% but in Britain and Canada, 11.4% and 13.3% respectively.

In countries with low family poverty rates the child benefits are increased at times of increasing unemployment, low wage increases, or rising inflation. This is done by maintaining universal family allowances at a relatively high level in relation to average industrial wage levels. This allows the use of supplementary family benefits in the countries that have them in a more targeted way. This policy is just the opposite from what we have done here. The level of our universal family allowances are too insignificant and cannot be used to offset income loss or increases in the cost of living. Even if we reversed the actual benefit levels of family allowances and the refundable child tax credit, their combined effect would not be enough to move a significant number of families from poverty.

What some of the European countries have recognized is that the more generous they are with their universal program the better protected families with children are against labour market induced poverty. Family allowances are widely accepted as an instrument of income redistribution from childless people to those raising children. They represent a national commitment to redistributing income to families with children because these families have greater income needs because of the presence of children.

European supplementary family allowances on the whole are limited in scope. The French program is only 1/5 of the cost of the universal program. It is income related and tied to the age of the

child. Its maximum benefit is 1/5 more than the universal benefit. This combination allows France to operate an effective two-tier family allowance system to protect family income and to keep families out of poverty.

EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR CHILD CARE GIVERS

The educational requirements for child care personnel are similar in France and Germany. The supervisors of those caring for children under the age of two in France are required to be pediatric nurses rather than having an Early Childhood Education degree. Programs for the under two's are funded by the Ministry of Health while those for children over two fall under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education.

WIDESPREAD USE OF INSTITUTIONAL CHILD CARE

The Ecoles Maternelles in France provide public child care for children outside their parental home. They are open up to 15 hours a day. The regular working day hours are funded by the state. Parents whose children attend from 9:00 to 4:00 do not pay a cent. If parents start work at 8:00 and deliver their child to the centre at 7:00 they will have to pay for those two hours. They will also have to pay an additional chargeif they pick up the child fter 4:00 p.m. The extra amounts charged are related to family income and, therefore, affordable. There is a charge for lunch if the child stays for lunch. Ecoles Maternelles are attended by the children of both working and non-working parents. They are used by all parents and are considered as providing children with an important educational development opportunity. In France 45% of all 2-year olds are enrolled in an Ecole Maternelle, enrolment increases to 65% for 3-year olds and by age four 95% of all French children attend. Ecoles Maternelles are open 12 months of the year. Staff work an 8-hour shift. They have to have an Early Childhood Education degree and those working with 5-year olds, the school entry age, have to have a primary school degree. The 5-6-year olds are given considerably more school preparation than the younger children.

In Germany 70% of all 3-year olds attend kindergarten either all or half days. The major concern of the kindergarten program is with the welfare of the child. Germans prefer child care provisions in their neighbourhood. The policy position has been to avoid children being dragged along to the parent's place of work which might be far away from where the family lives. In France people too have a preference for neighbourhood child care provisions and the Ecole Maternelle is usually run out of a neighbourhood school. In Germany, where most churches operate a kindergarten, they have built attractive looking additions to the churches for the children. The State has accepted the need for pleasant surroundings as necessary for the healthy development and the intellectual stimulation of the children.

In contrast to France, Germany gives preference to the children of working parents for a kindergarten space. Parents cannot argue that their only child needs interaction with other children and, therefore, should be admitted. The child will be accepted if there is room. Single parents in the work force are given absolute priority for a space.

PARENTAL LEAVE POLICY

Sweden has the most generous and only non-sexist leave policy for parents. The use of language in Sweden provides itself an indication of this. Swedes do not even talk about maternity leave any more; they consider this an outdated concept. They now talk about parental leave policies.

Until 1988, the Swedish government covered 90% of the income of either parent on parental leave over a period of nine months. This period will be increased to 12 months in 1989, 15 months in 1990 and 18 months in 1991. In addition to this, parents receive $107 a month per child in family allowances.

Parental leave can be arranged in the most flexible way: a parent can work part-time, or the full 9 months can be used over a period of up to three years. In urban centres in Sweden the work day of a parent can be reduced to 6 hours. Flex time is encouraged to make parental leave policy as responsive as possible to parental needs. Those taking parental leave do not suffer any loss of seniority or promotion chances at their place of work.
The purpose of the leave policy is to make it possible for both parents to remain in the work force. Sweden is the only country that has an official commitment to offering both sexes the opportunity to combine parental responsibilities with employment responsibilities. However, the take-up rate of parental leave is quite low among Swedish men. Men do take some time off paid employment but not nearly as much time as they could if they were more committed to the idea.

The question is why men are not using the parental leave option. Some interesting statistics on this issue have emerged from the Hungarian experience with parental leave policy. In Hungary parents can stay out of the work force for a period of 3 years. The state pays the stay-at-home parent 40% of the average income of an unskilled worker which is not very much. Hungary has published data on who is using the program. Findings indicate that the majority of stay-at-home parents are women at the lowest income level. The higher a woman's income the less likely she is to take advantage of the parental leave policy. Top income women hardly use it at all. The 27% of high income women who took advantage of the program were married to high income men. It has been assumed that had these women been married to low income men they would probably not have opted to stay home. The conclusion one may draw from the Hungarian findings is that the high income women in that country behave in the same way as the Swedish men.

If one can generalize from the experience of these two countries it would seem that the higher the income loss is going to be the less likely both women and men are to drop out of the labour force even if it is only for a limited period of time. This raises the question whether this choice is purely economically motivated, or whether high income women, like men, who generally are better paid than women, prefer labour force participation to providing child care. It is widely believed that women have a natural desire to take care of their children. An examination of history, however, shows that rich women have never personally taken care of children. The Queen, for instance, is not blamed for being an unnatural mother because she had nannies to take care of her children.

Some women and men clearly would prefer to take care of children. As a society we should encourage them to do so and pay them well for the service they provide in helping to raise the next generation. Children have been described as a country's most crucial resource. Those who are charged with their care and intellectual and emotional development should be well rewarded in accordance with the social importance of their task.

To increase male participation in child rearing the Swedish feminist movement has been toying with the idea that parental leave should be mandated. But even the responsive social democratic government in Sweden is not willing to go that far. The policy issue here is whether it is fair to expect a male surgeon to stay at home for 9 months when it is even doubtful that a female surgeon would do so.

The orientation of European government policies, in relation to child care provisions, is different from Canada's. In France, the state seems to prefer women, particularly low income women, to stay at home and take care of a child under the age of two. But once the child is over the age of two French social policies signal that women can send their child to the Ecole Maternelle and take up employment. In France, Germany and Sweden there seems to exist a deeply rooted resistance to use social assistance as the major source of income for parent(s) and children. This is not the case in Britain which, like Canada, has poor child care arrangements in place. In the other three countries every possible help is given in the form of housing allowances and family allowances to make it economically advantageous for parents to join and remain in the workforce. This is done because of a strong belief that it is not good for children to be brought up on what we call 'welfare'.

OTHER PARENTAL SUPPORT POLICIES

In addition, Sweden has a generous sick day policy of 90 days a year which covers the illnesses of both parents and children. In Sweden parents do not have to lie to their employers that they are sick when it is, in fact, their child that is sick. Parents can take time off work to take a child to see a doctor.

In West Germany married women are allowed half a day off work every second week to catch up on housework and shopping. In Canada we consider such a policy sexist because it confirms women as being primarily responsible for housework. German women are more pragmatic. They admit it is sexist but they see it also as a benefit which is practical and useful to them.

CONCLUSION

The implicit perspective in the child care provisions in France, Germany and Sweden is influenced by the recognition that once children are born, their well-being becomes a public, social and moral as well as a private, personal and family obligation. In other words, children are a shared responsibility between their parents and the state. The state thus plays a crucial part in the funding and the design of child care in these countries.

Brigitte Kitchen is an Associate Professor in the School of Social Work, York University, North York.

INNOVATION, RESEARCH AND EMERGING TRENDS

A presentation on current and upcoming research and innovations.

WORKING FAMILIES PROJECT

Sue Griggs

THE WORKING FAMILIES PROJECT: WHO WE ARE

We are a Toronto-based group of people who are interested in aspects of the interface between the systems of work and organizations with the systems of the family which include single-parent and dual-career families. Essentially, the intent of the group is to examine and suggest organizational interventions to strengthen and support employees who are family members. The Working Families Project is supported and sponsored by the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto and Dr. Laura Johnson of the SPC has spearheaded the committee from its inception in 1981. The group receives minimal financial support and has sought funding from various sectors for the various projects which it has developed. Membership is notable because of the joint representation of approximately fifteen members. The group is represented by the following sectors: Academic, Business, Parents, Community and Labour with some members representing more than one sector. The group has met four or five times a year as a whole, while a small steering committee has met monthly to monitor ongoing projects.

THE WORKING FAMILY COMMITTEE: WHAT IT DOES

The functions of the Working Family Committee are:

- Information and Referral
- Community Education
- Public Speaking
- Research

Over the years, the group has spent a great deal of time keeping on top of the latest data or most recent information. We have been involved in two major research studies and have held community education events such as three Toronto-based conferences. Dialogues were held between various sectors such as employers, labour, government, and community groups. The main purpose of the group is to increase awareness of work/family issues and to act as a network or hub for information or innovative ideas.

WORKING FAMILY ISSUES

Organizations and labour are just beginning to realize that the interface between work patterns and family life are connected. In some cases professional women are opting out of corporations to spend time with their families, and organizations, in general, are seeing good people being lost. In some organizations, recruiters are having problems attracting women to specific job opportunities. Organizations that have tried innovative responses are seeing advantages of experimenting, even on a limited basis. However, many organizations are still not aware that this is important. In fact, although the majority of people view thse topics as women's issues, we view work and family issues as ones for society to examine. The media is showing increased coverage to working family issues. The points outlined below seem to be the main reasons for such increased interest:

- Increasing female labour force participation
- Increasing numbers of working mothers of infants in the labour force
- Increase in shift work
- Increasing interest of fathers in family life
- Increased need for child care and elder care
- Decrease in numbers of available work force

Employer interest in work/family issues varies with changing business cycles and changing employment needs.

WORKING FAMILY PROJECT HISTORY

1981 - Conference On Workplace Child Care
The Working Family Group held a conference on workplace child care which attracted a number of Toronto organizations which were interested in finding out about the complexity of deciding on and implementing centres

1982 - Research On Dual Earner Families
Conference On Work and Quality of Family Life
Members of the Group interviewed both members of dual-earner families and representatives from organizations

to discuss possible initiatives. Interest in the topic was high, even though most organizations were not involved in actual planning. Interest was strong enough for the Group to plan a conference which focused on complementary options.

1985 - Employer Survey on Complementary Employment Options
With the help of a grant from the Ontario Women's Directorate, we sponsored a survey to assess the prevalence and interest in these options.

1986 - Workshop On Complementary Employment Options
This workshop grew directly because of the interest and examples expressed through the survey. The workshop was seen as a forum to discuss and disseminate both theoretical and practical principles in ascertaining feasilbilty and implementation.

1987 - Survey Of Work/Family Resource Programs
After the workshop, there was a need to find out what was happening in the area of work and family, and the survey was organized to find out not only what was available in North America, but what type of organizational structure was the most useful.

1988 - Publication of "Putting The Pieces Together", a compendium of work and family resource programs.

COMPLEMENTARY EMPLOYMENT OPTIONS

The following policies or practices are often called Alternative Work Options. However, we have called them Complementary Employment Options as we see these options as a regular part of work rather than as separate or alternative. In examining these options we have looked at relevant issues, outlined the pros and cons of each option and provided real life examples.

These options are:

- Job Sharing
- Flexible Work Schedules
- Parental/Family Leave
- Work at Home
- Permanent Part-Time Work
- Work Related Child Care

EMPLOYER SURVEY ON COMPLEMENTARY EMPLOYMENT OPTIONS

In 1985, we initiated a Metropolitan Toronto survey to ascertain which of the employment options that interested or were actually used by employers. Questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of employers with small, medium and large employee bases. The final sample, 49% response rate, was of 494 Toronto-area employers with at least 50 employees. There was a great deal of employer interest in the study.

The survey results showed the following use of complementary options:

PREVALENCE OF COMPLEMENTARY EMPLOYMENT OPTION

Arrangement	Projected Population of Employers (3803) %
Flex Time	25.0
Part Time	19.9
Paid Personal /Family Leave	17.0
Maternity Leave	14.5
Paternity Leave	5.4
Job Sharing	5.7
Work At Home	4.5
Workplace Day Care	.4

The survey showed the following interest in complementary options:

EMPLOYER INTEREST IN COMPLEMENTARY EMPLOYMENT OPTIONS

Arrangement	Percentage of Employers Very Interested
Flex Time	6.7
Work Related Day Care	9.0
Part-Time Work with Pro-Rated Benefits	6.2
Job Sharing	5.8
Maternity and Adoption Leave	5.2
Paid Leave for Child and Family Responsibilities	4.6
Paternity and Adoption Leave	3.9
Work At Home	3.6

EMPLOYER CONCERNS

Organizations had the five following concerns about implementing complementary employment options:

- We are not a social service.
- We have no expertise in the day care area.
- There is and should be a division between work and family.
- Cost is too high.
- Internal relations and resentment between staff who might be taking advantage of options.

EMPLOYEE CONCERNS

Employees had the following concerns:

• Working parents value complementary employment options for reasons of child care.
• Employees may stay with a job because of complementary employment options.
• Trade-offs: employed parents may sacrifice benefits to have flexibility in hours/location.

WORK/FAMILY RESOURCES

The question of "Who actually cares about work/family issues?", has come up several times in our research and discussions. The following three groups seem to have the most interest:

• Private and non-profit consulting firms
• Day Care Groups
• Family Service OrganizationsThe target groups, at this point, appear to be:
• Women
• Professionals
• Persons re-entering the work force.

The services and programs most offered are:

• Facilitating matches
• Research
• Education

SOCIETAL CONCERNS AND IMPLICATIONS

There are several concerns that have broad implications. The first one is the issue of who controls and who monitors the policy or program that is put into place. Decisions over accessibility, affordability and control are important to look at. Secondly, there is a concern for equity for workers in the public versus the private sector, workers in a small firm versus those in a larger firmand those workers who are in a union versus professional non-union staff. Thirdly, there is concern over the employer's perception that this is a women's issue. At this point, the most likely movement is in female-dominated workplaces. Also, there is still therestriction of child care responsibility in the family to mothers rather than a shared responsibility.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The Working Family Project Group decided late in 1988, mostly as a result of the 1987 survey results, that its most useful role would be to serve as a clearing house and support base for all the groups that are involved in addressing work and family issues. The Council on Work and Family Life has since been set up to meet these needs.

Sue Griggs is a Consultant with the Working Families Project, Toronto.

WORK AND FAMILY LIFE SURVEY

Laura C. Johnson

This survey research project investigates how parental employment patterns may affect parenting, family life and children's development. Focussing on two-parent families with young, school-age children, the study examines both dual-earner and so-called "traditional" families (mother works as a homemaker, father employed outside the home). The study looks at the family as a system, probing the interrelationships between structural characteristics of parental work roles, their attitudes toward their own and their spouse's work roles, their attitudes about their parenting roles, and their children's behavior.

The survey utilizes a representative sample of 249 urban Canadian families with children aged 8 and 9 years. Recruited with the assistance of a local public school board, the sample includes families with a broad mix of ethnic and socio-demographic backgrounds.

The study is based on face-to-face interviews conducted in families' own homes, in the language of their choice. The interviews utilized a combination of structured and open-ended measures, and included a number of standardized measures.
Following is a summary of some of the key findings of the study.

• Parents in dual-earner and traditional families do not differ in feelings of parental competence or frustration with parenting.

• Among both dual-earner and traditional families, mothers spend more time with their children than do fathers.

• Homemaking mothers spend more time per week with their children than do employed mothers (48 hours vs 45 hours). Fathers in dual-earner families spend more time with their children than do fathers in traditional families (31 vs 28 hours).

• There is no overall difference in levels of affectionate ties within dual-earner as compared with traditional families.

• There is no overall difference in psychological well-being (behavior problems, self-esteem) of children in dual-earner and traditional families.

• Among traditional families, mothers' and fathers' social support networks have a positive impact on children's self-esteem.

• Among dual-earner families, boys have higher self-esteem when their mothers work fewer hours per week and when mothers have higher job satisfaction.

• Among dual-earner families, girls have higher self-esteem when mothers work more hours, and when fathers have non-traditional sex-role attitudes.

• Among dual-earner families, mother's work hours (hours worked and non-day hours) have a negative effect on the number of hours she spends with the child, and no effect on the mother's feelings of parental competence, frustration with parenting, or affectionate ties within the family.

• Among dual-earner families, father's work hours have negative effects on the hours he spends with the child and on affectionate ties.

STUDY DESIGN

Independent Variables

• Socio-demographic characteristics (ethnicity, language, occupation, income, education, family size and structure, religion)

• Job characteristics (hours of work, work schedule, non-day work hours, flexibility of work schedule, job satisfaction, perceived work/family fit)

• Attitudes toward spouse/partner's work/family fit

• Sex-role attitudes

• Social support networks

Dependent Variables

• Parental feelings of competence, frustration with parenting

• Parent's time spent with child

• Affectionate ties within the family

• Child's psychological well-being (self-esteem, behavior problems)

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

• How do parental employment patterns, including employment status, number of hours worked per week, and work schedules affect performance of the parental role?

• Do men and women differ in the ways their employment patterns affect the parenting role?

• How do parental employment patterns affect attitudes toward parenting and parents' perceptions of their level of competence as parents?

• To what extent do parental employment patterns influence affectionate ties within the family?

• What are the effects of parental employment patterns on young, school-age children? In particular, do characteristics of parents' employment have an impact on children's psychological well-being (self-esteem, behavior problems)?

Sample Characteristics Mean Scores

Sample Characteristics	Traditional Families (n=57)	Dual-Earner Families (n=193)
Mother's Age	36.2 years	36.2 years
Gross Annual family income	$34,000	$39,000
Number of children	2.7	2.2

Laura Johnson is a Research Director of The Child, Youth and Family Policy Research Centre, Toronto.

CONFERENCE BOARD OF CANADA

Judy MacBride-King

The Conference Board of Canada is an independent, non-policy prescriptive, not-for-profit, research organization which provides its members with information on which they can base their business decisions. We are funded by over 700 public and private sector organizations across Canada and by labour groups. We are affiliated with the Conference Board Inc. in the United States and the Conference Board in Belgium. Worldwide we have over 3,000 associates.

The CRC is an independently funded research group within the

Board. We are funded by over 60 organizations which, in return for their support, receive a number of services, including a variety of meetings and conferences on compensation and HR issues. Our primary everyday job is answering information requests from our associates. We gather this information using a variety of techniques such as literature searches or full-fledged surveys.

Now, let me tell you about our research program, Canadian Work Environments and Changing Family Structures. As mentioned, the program involves a comprehensive examination of the issue of work and family from the perspectives of employers, employees and unions.
Our research program has its roots in discussions with one of our associates. This organization had had an affirmative action program in place for a number of years. However, upon reviewing their record in the affirmative action arena, they found that, despite the program, women were severely underrepresented in the upper levels of management. There was some discussion of why this could be. One of the obvious reasons was the career path necessary for those destined to senior management to follow.

In order to be considered for promotion in this organization, women, and all those within the management category, had to travel both nationally and internationally to gain a broad base of experience. In order to gain this experience they had to relocate frequently. For a number of reasons women were not as likely as their male colleagues to relocate and, therefore, were not as likely to gain the experience which was considered necessary for them to advance.

The idea of a study was born out of this discussion. Having said that, I would like to re-assert our belief that the issue of work and family is not a so-called 'women's issue'. It is a family issue and it is an issue which affects employers.

It affects not only women but also men in organizations and it is families who have to organize their schedules in order to get things done at home and at work.

Given the changes in the demographic picture of Canada, and projections for the future, we believe that this was and is an important issue for employers to consider. Once the idea for the study was born, we sought support for it from both the public and private sectors and from labour groups. We have been successful in gathering together a dynamic group of individuals which forms an Advisory Board to the research program. The Board meets periodically to discuss the issue of work and family generally, and to discuss the study itself. We have relied on our Board for advice in the construction of the questionnaires and in the overall direction of the study. Some of these organizations are permitting us to go survey their employees regarding work and family issues. Some are supporting the study in other ways.

Let me now take a moment to describe our research program. The first perspective sought was that of employers in Canada. We have undertaken and completed a major survey of employers which was designed to gather information about the existence of employment practices, policies and benefits that assist employees in balancing their work and family lives. In particular, we asked employers about the provision of childcare benefits, benefits for those who care for elderly or disabled family members, as well as about a variety of special leaves, and alternative working arrangements.

We also explored the extent to which employers felt that certain human resource problems, i.e. absenteeism, tardiness, employee stress, productivity, etc., could be attributed to the difficulties experienced by employees as they attempt to juggle their responsibilities at work and other aspects of their lives.

In addition, we asked employers their opinions about the effectiveness of the various family-related policies and benefits in alleviating human resource problems, and their opinions regarding the responsibilities of employers, governments, unions and employees in seeking solutions designed to alleviate work/family conflicts.

We surveyed 1,600 small, medium and large organizations in both the public and private sectors in Canada. The organizations surveyed were from all sectors of our economy. We received 385 reponses to the questionnaire.

In addition to the mailed survey we will also be undertaking interviews with organizations, particulary those who responded to the self-administered questionnaire. Through these interviews we hope to learn more about the processes leading up to the implementation of family-related supports. We want to hear about the successes and the barriers to success experienced by organizations.

In addition to our comprehensive look at the situation from the

employer's point of view, we are also looking at the issue of work and family from the employee's perspective. We are surveying over 11,000 Canadian employees working in both the public and private sectors regarding their family responsibilities and the extent to which they are experiencing difficulties in finding a comfortable fit between their responsibilities at home and their responsibilities at work.

When we talk about family responsibilities in this research, we are referring to home maintenance, i.e. housework, small household tasks, and dependant care — the care of children, elderly, disabled or infirm family members.

Through the survey of individual workers we are exploring the extent to which the individual's family responsibilities affect them at work, both in terms of their personal well-being and in terms of their job advancement opportunities. A key focus of the study is to explore the extent to which an employee's responsibilities at home, or outside of the workplace, affect his or her performance at work and the extent to which the balancing of work and family contributes to employee absenteeism.

We also hope to learn about the difficulties individuals are experiencing in meeting their child care and elder care needs and we want to know the policies, practices and benefits that they feel would best meet their needs. To this end surveys of employees in eight organizations have either been completed or are in the final processes of being organized. To date the response to our survey of individuals in organizations has been excellent, as high as 86%.

We will be following up the mailed survey with individual interviews with people who have responded to the questionnaire. Through these interviews we will explore the ways in which individuals actually manage work and family. We hope to learn from their experiences.

The third perspective sought on this issue is that of labour. We will be carrying out in-depth interviews with unions in Canada to determine the degree to which union representatives feel that this issue is of importance to their members, the degree that the issue of work and family will become an issue in future negotiations, and the attitudes of unions about their responsibility and the responsibility of others in assisting their members in finding a better balance between work and family.

I would like, at this time, to present to you some of the preliminary findings of our survey of Canadian employers. Please keep in mind that the data are preliminary and the analysis not yet complete. The 385 organizations who responded to our questionnaire employ, in total, over 1.1 million Canadians. Most of the respondent organizations employ under 1,000 employees, slightly over 1/3 up to 5,000, and almost 13% are large employers (that is, they employ over 5,000 employees). About 44% of those who responded are in the manufacturing sector and the remainder are non-manufacturers. The majority are private sector employers while 13% are from the public sector. Almost 3% classify themselves as charitable or non-profit organizations. Respondent organizations were located across Canada with the majority having their headquarters in central Canada.

Preliminary runs on the data indicate that, although some of the employers we surveyed are providing some form of support for workers with family responsibilities, the majority are not. Having said that, other Conference Board data indicates that the number of employers offering such policies has increased over the past few years.

In addition, some of the employers we surveyed indicated that they may consider or are actively considering the implementation of a variety of supports, the most popular being: support for child care centres, child care information and related services and elder care information and related services. The main reasons given by employers for not offering family-related benefits were: some had never considered these types of benefits, some had not heard of the need for these benefits from their employees, some employers believe that their organizations should not be involved in these types of benefits and some noted the expense associated with implementation.

When we asked employers for their opinions regarding who they felt had the most responsibility to accommodate conflicts between employees' work and personal responsibilities, the majority of employers indicated that employees have that responsibility. However, they were more likely to indicate that they, as employers, have a greater role to play than either unions or governments.

As an aside note, early returns to the survey of employees indicate that employees also believe that they should have the primary responsibility, but their employers, governments and unions have important roles to play.

Let us look at some of the benefits and leaves, etc. being offered by the employers in our survey. The first is in regard to child care. The

most popular form of employer-provided supports for employees with children is child care information and related services, assistance to employees with sick children, child care centres (either on-site child care centres or support for child care through a subsidy to the employee or to the centre) and the provision of parent education seminars.

Fewer employers (between 2 and 6%) offer benefits to employees who provide care to elderly relatives. Of those who do, the most frequently mentioned types of options were elder care information and related services and assistance in caring for elderly relatives at home or in institutions. We assume that the latter forms of assistance refer to some sort of a subsidy to the employee to help offset the cost of caring for an elderly relative.

Some employers also offer assistance to employees who provide care to disabled relatives. Again, the form of support primarily mentioned was information regarding the care of disabled relatives.

Furthermore, a significant number of employers offer a variety of services to employees through Employee Assistance Programs. About 1/2 of the respondents indicated that they have EAP's and almost 1/2 of these also extend some of the EAP services offered to the families of employees.

In addition, we asked employers whether or not they provide opportunities for employees to schedule their work in alternative ways. Nearly one in two of the employers surveyed indicated that they have instituted flexible working hours in their organizations and almost 1/3 offer the option of part-time work with pro-rated benefits. In addition, over 1/4 of those surveyed have compressed work-week schedules. In each of these cases, (flex-time, part-time work with pro-rated benefits and compressed work-week schedules), the majority have formalized these options through policy.

In addition, almost 20% offered job-sharing arrangements and 10% work-at-home arrangements. However, the majority have no formal policy covering these arrangements.

In terms of the provison of leaves offered by employers, not surprising, bereavement leave was the most prevalent, followed by time off in lieu of overtime pay and job-related educational leave.

Almost half of the employers told us that they also have special leave for family-related reasons and they permit employees to use their personal sick leave for family reasons. However, again, these types of leaves or arrangements were provided on an informal basis in the majority of cases.

Slightly over 8% of the organizations have "other parental leave", that is child nurturing leave. Again, most offer this on an informal basis.

Many employers, almost half of them, offer extended maternity leaves and almost 1/4 pre-maternity leaves. In both cases these leaves are offered through informal arrangements rather than formal policy.

Over 1/3 of the respondents offer adoption leave and almost 20% paternity leave. In both instances the employers have a formal policy which addresses these leaves.

Preliminary indications are that those employers who offer a variety of family-related benefits and leaves, etc., believe that they have been effective in alleviating certain human resource problems. Generally, those employers who offer child care supports, alternative work arrangements and a variety of leaves found them to be particularly effective in the retention and recruitment of employees (retention was a number one issue when we talked about child care), in reducing employee stress, in maintaining employee morale and in reducing the rates of absenteeism in their organizations.

Some of these findings are in keeping with what we are seeing from the data collected from employees. Preliminary results, (and I stress that these data are preliminary as we are still going through the process of data collection), suggest that many of the employees we surveyed have left an employer and/or are considering leaving their current employers, or have reduced their work time because of the difficulties they are experiencing in balancing work and family. Furthermore, there appears to be a consistent relationship between the degree to which people are experiencing difficulties and the degree to which they are absent from work. It will be interesting to see if these patterns hold as we analyze more of the data.

Note: The report summarizing the findings of the survey of Canadian organizations will be available in May, 1989.
The report which summarizes the information gathered from individuals will be available in the fall, probably in September, 1989.

Judy MacBride-King is a Research Associate with The Conference Board of Canada, Ottawa.

RESEARCH SURVEY - M.L. FRANKEL AND ASSOCIATES

Dr. Mark Frankel

Before I tell you about the actual study I would like to describe the kind of classification and rating system that I worked out to rate how people think about relationships between work and family life. I call my system a "three-dog" rating system.

The first level is the model that some people have of a relationship between work and family called the 'dog and flea' model. The 'dog and flea' model is basically the model in which one of those variables, either work or family life, is a centralized thing and the other is kind of a distraction, i.e. something that may afflict people once in a while or may distract their attention but is not a major influence. The places where I have seen that 'dog and flea' model most frequently is in my work with family therapists. I will ask a family therapist who is working with a family and trying to effect some major change in what is going on in that family, what is it that the parents do day to day, do they work, what kind of work do they do, and if they do work and you know something about the kind of work they do how do they feel about it? For the most part I get blanks when I ask those workers or other family therapists about those kinds of items, despite the fact that most people, and certainly people who are employed, spend the greatest amount of time in their day working. Yet when people talk about affecting family life they often do not look at that part of people's lives.

The other place where I have found the 'dog and flea' model to be popular is in many workplaces. Certainly there are still many workplaces where people in management positions and other positions as well, tend to think about families as a distraction, as a side issue, as something that really does not affect and should not affect employees.

The second level is the 'dog and cat model'. There has been a lot of research, particularly early research, in this field that fits the 'dog and cat' model which basically seems to assume that work and family are natural enemies. What goes on in terms of the demands of work and the experiences of work, and what goes on at home in family life are kind of naturally antagonistic to each other. You see a lot of research that starts with the concept of work/family conflict for instance rather than starting with a more neutral kind of a concept which assumes that perhaps other things could be going on. Some research was very important in breaking ground in this field, and talks about spillover from work to family or vice versa. Again that word 'spillover' does not sound very friendly, it sounds like inevitably these two things are a problem when put together.

Finally, the third level in our three-dog rating system is the 'dog and pony' model. This model assumes that the two go together and affect one another in both positive and negative ways. They are both vital parts of the "show". I think that the research that I am going to describe to you is an example of that. I think more and more research that is emerging now is of that variety. There are many potential positive influences of work on family, and family on work, and certainly when you research this area you want to approach it in a way that allows you to find some of the positive influences in interaction between the two as well as the negative points.

It is because of my interest in that kind of approach that I started stressing the concept of 'family fit' which is a more neutral kind of term. Either you can have a poor fit or a good fit, and the term itself does not predispose whether you are somebody doing the research, or somebody reading it, to make a conclusion about it. The research I am going to describe to you today is the first examination as to how useful that concept of work/family fit is and what the implications of work/family fit are.

Specifically, in terms of this research, what we tried to find out was, first of all. "Is there some variety in terms of work/family fit?" Is work/family fit just a big problem for everybody? In reading the newspapers or popular magazines, for the most part, you conclude that work/family fit is problematic for everyone.

We wanted to see if there is some range or variety in work/family fit and we particularly wanted to look at what are the implications if there is a range or variety. Does it have any implications for how that person functions on the job or how that person feels about their job, and also how they function in family life and feel about family life. Again, I want to stress that this is a preliminary, exploratory study in this area.

Finally, the other big question that we began to look at is: "Under what conditions do people with good work/family fit function?" In other words, what are their work lives like, what are their working conditions like, what are their homes like vs people with poor work/family fit. Those are the things that we began to look at.

In terms of the study, we went into three different corporations, The Toronto Dominion Bank, Steelcase Canada and a food manufacturing company.

In each of those three companies we recruited volunteers. The condition of recruitment was that they were people who had a child under the age of 14 and, of course, were working. Those were the only conditions which were required of them. First we had face-to-face interviews with them at work and secondly with them and their families at home for a total of about 3 hours worth of study with each employee and family. During that period of time we administered both some paper and pencil measures and also interviewed them in a semi-structured way. The central paper and pencil measure we used was a modification of the Bank Street questionnaire that has been the basis for much of the research described by Ellen Galinsky. There are several other paper and pencil measures as well as quite extensive interviews with both the employee and their spouse or partner if they had one. Children were not directly involved in the interviews but observed if they were available, but that is not a specific focus in the study.

The sample that we used totalled 109 employees. In terms of the sample, there is roughly a 60-40 split between women and men who volunteered for the study.

In terms of income levels what we are tapping in this research is a middle-class sample, both lower middle class and upper middle class equally. We were certainly not tapping into many people who are close to or below the poverty line or to people who are extremely wealthy.

Virtually all of our sample, 86%, tended to have a spouse or partner. That means that we had only a very small number of single parents in this study and even though I will make some comments about single parents based on some observations, we do not have a lot of good statistics with high numbers to back that up yet.

Virtually all of the sample were also dual-career parents and had the famous "1.8 children". We also looked at the age of the youngest child that each employee had because the age of the youngest child is often felt to be more important than the number of children they had or the average age of the children.

The first question we asked was, "Is there some variation between people's work/family fit?" We found, by the way, that the way to measure work/family fit that was most productive in this research, was to ask a very simple question which was "How well do your work and family fit together?" Graded from 1-5 from 'very well' to 'very poorly', we found that there is quite a range. The majority of people report that their fit is either good or very good. There is a significant number of people, however, who report a poor or mediocre fit and at the extreme there are people who are giving 5 who are really very pleased with how their work and family fit together.

We wanted to look at why, in other words, what this has to do with work and family. We found a very strong relationship between work/family fit and job satisfaction. People with high work/family fit reported significantly higher job satisfaction and vice versa. It tends to mirror the kind of data Ellen Galinsky reported in some of her research.

When we asked people whether, if they knew before they took this job what they know now about their job, would they take the same job again, we found a very strong relationship between work/family fit and the answer to that question. People with poor work/family fit said, "No, I would not take this job again" or at least said "I would have serious questions about taking this job", whereas people with good work/family fit answered the opposite way. We think that has some obvious implications for how work/family fit may relate to turnover and retention.

We also found that there is a very strong relationship between work/family fit and absenteeism. Absenteeism was significantly higher in people with low work/family fit. Again, this mirrors some of the research of Ellen Galinsky.

In terms of promotion, frankly we have a result that is pretty uninterpretable because we did not have a large enough sample to control for number of years in the company. So we found no significant relationship between work/family fit and promotions, but I think the question is still an open one because we could not look systematically at people within a company who had a chance for a promotion over the same time period. So, that one is

still a question mark in our research.

Men and women were not significantly different in terms of the average work/family fit that they reported. That was a surprise. I find that very interesting because we also found that women certainly on average reported that they felt they were getting less support from their spouse in terms of handling their family responsibilities than did men. And women also reported higher levels of stress and conflict around work and family issues. But when it came to asking them "How well does your work and family fit together?" they answered the same as men. So, there are a variety of ways to interpret that and one that occurred to me was that the women had lower expectations of how well these things are supposed to work than men.

In terms of marital status, again, we only have an informal impression here from looking at people who have a spouse or partner and people who are single parents. We do not have enough people in the single-parent group to make a statistical comparison. I can certainly make an observation from the interviews that single parents we have interviewed appear to be under much greater stress.

In terms of family satisfaction, we had a formal paper and pencil measure of family satisfaction, designed by David Olson, and we found that there was a highly significant relationship between work/family fit and family satisfaction, i.e. how good a person was feeling about their family and their family life.

Finally, in terms of work/family conflict and work/family stress, we asked a series of questions which come from the Bank Street questionnaire about how difficult it is for you to perform a responsibility at home because of your work responsibilities; how difficult it is for you to perform a work responsibility because of what is happening in your home, etc. The stress questions really reflect the degree of anxiety and worry that people have about balancing their work and family life.

Once again we found a strong relationship between work/family fit on the one hand and the response to this. There were people with high work/family fit and low levels of conflict or stress and vice versa.

The last part of the study was concerned with trying to look at what work conditions might be associated with high work/family fit and what family conditions might be associated with that as well. We were very interested in looking at those people who are succeeding in this and what is it about their work life or their family life that might be connected with the fact that they are doing well.

We found three major factors in each sphere. First of all let us look at the work factors. Again, this set of findings is consistent and reinforces some of the research work which Ellen Galinsky and other researchers have reported.

First of all, in terms of work conditions, those employees who reported feeling that they had a higher degree of control over the time they worked were people with higher work/family fit. That did not necessarily relate to total control over work hours or to the total number of hours that were worked, but rather related to how able they were to control their work time in emergencies or unusual situations. If people were able to have control over the critical times, that seemed to be a very important predictor of high work/family fit. The other factors were a supervisor who was flexible and understanding and a peer support system in the workplace.

On the family side the first factor was adaptation. Adaptation has to do with flexibility and the willingness of people in the family to trade off roles and jobs in the face of a crises. For instance, if one is going out of town on business, which could be a "normal" kind of crisis, or if the child is sick, or if the child care breaks down, etc., the family with high work/family fit were those where there was a real willingness for the opposite sex or partner to grab some of the roles or jobs and be willing to do it. That kind of flexibility and adaptability when circumstances change is critical.

The second family factor was cohesion. Cohesion is shown in families who have a fierce passion for togetherness. These were families where the individuals tended not to do things on their own or with friends outside the family. They tended to take every available minute that they had apart from work and pour that into family life. I am not saying that overall that is a desirable thing to do, but we have to think about the connection between this and work/family fit. Certainly those families put a premium on togetherness. They would spend a lot of time sharing with each other their work experiences. These were families where the children knew in great detail what was going on at their parents' work.

Some of these families had rituals where they would systematically sit down at dinner and go around the table and say what happened at work and so forth. These were families where the spouses became very involved in their spouse's work. They often acted as consultants or coaches for their spouse. That became an important ingredient in the other spouse's success.

The third family factor was, finally, a 'can do' attitude which means a real positive attitude about what happens if we run into trouble, whether it is a mundane day-to-day kind of problem or one of us loses a job or whatever. These were families with an attitude of "we can roll with the punches" and "we know how to overcome difficulties" vs families who were very afraid of those kinds of crises.

Those are the things that connected with work/family fit. I think the next direction around this is to look at whether changes in these conditions would affect work/family fit and whether we can affect work/family fit in a positive way. This will be the subject of our next study.

Dr. Mark Frankel is President, M.L. Frankel and Associates, Toronto, and assists private and public-sector corporations with work/family issues.

POLICY DIRECTIONS IN WORK AND FAMILY

Naomi Alboim

I have been involved in the issue of work and family responsibilites for some time now. I have been living it for even longer. And to me, the popularity of the event we are participating in this week signals a long-overdue recognition of an issue that is vital to all of us.

Today I am focussing primarily on the role of government in integrating work and family life.

To begin with I would like to put this discussion of policy directions in context, by giving you some background on how we came to the issue, what we are doing about it now and what kind of options are available to us as we search for solutions.

First of all, let me tell you how the Ontario Government first turned its attention to the harmonization of work and family responsibilities.

The Ontario Women's Directorate is a government agency that advocates on behalf of women. The goal of our Directorate basically is equality for the women of this province, in terms of economic, legal and social equality.

Within government we work closely with individual Ministries and agencies to develop policies, programs, and legislation that benefit women. We monitor the submissions to cabinet committees and we analyze the impact on women of current and proposed legislation.

It is also our job to detect gaps in existing programs, and point out policies and practices that may place women at a disadvantage. That is what we do *inside* government. *Outside*, we design and deliver programs to communities around Ontario and, through a community grants program, we support local projects and initiatives. We also work with business, labour and community groups to assist them to identify issues and develop solutions.

The Directorate played a leading role in the pay equity legislation that became law this year, for example. As well, to further employment equity, we provide consultative services and incentive programs to employers in the private and broader public sector. That, in capsule form, sums up our responsibilities. We enlist other ministries in promoting women's status in government policies and programs. At the same time, we advocate within the community to increase awareness of women's issues among employers, educators and the general public.

Accordingly, in 1987 the Directorate identified the balance of work and family responsibilities as a women's issue. Let me hasten to say, however, that we want to avoid the tendency to label this concern as "for women only."

Because it is, most emphatically, not simply a problem for women. It involves workers of both sexes, both young and old, with and without children, who have other family concerns. It is not only a "dual career" issue but concerns working couples and single people at all income levels.

But having said that, the fact remains that right now, it is primarily women who are carrying the dual burdens of work and family. It is still the *woman* who is taking on child care concerns, the *woman* who copes with aging and disabled relatives, the *woman* who is taking a larger proportion of the stress and anxiety created by these pressures.

If you look at the profile of the family today it is clear that people still assume the existence of what my Minister likes to call "The Father Knows Best" model, the fictional family that existed in only the rarest cases but was on TV every night and everyone assumed was the norm of a father who went to work every day leaving behind his wife already in her stockings, high heels and perfectly coiffed hairdo with the children happily dressed in the pressed outfit. He came home from a hard day's work to find a still wonderfully groomed wife and still beautifully clean children with supper on the table and an immaculate household.

That family, in my opinion, was never the norm. Although it was the media norm, it certainly is not the norm now. Statistically, only 16.5% of families today follow that so-called traditional model.

The other area that I really want to emphasize is the fastest growing age cohort, that of the over 65's. Family responsibilities include those beyond taking care of children. It is clear in my mind more and more family responsibilities are going to involve elder care. We are going to be confronted with enormous problems, much much worse than the ones we are facing now in the child care area, unless we start recognizing that fact and start dealing with it.

So, indeed, a significant part of the challenge that confronts all of us working on this issue, is the need to move men into a role that will have them assuming their fair share of domestic and family duties, thus allowing both male and females to maintain secure jobs and pursue careers.

So, recognizing the importance of supporting work and family integration, the Ontario Women's Directorate introduced a paper at a meeting of Ministers Responsible for the Status of Women across the country which was subsequently discussed and tabled at the First Ministers' conference in 1987.

This conference is an annual forum in which the prime minister and all provincial premiers meet to discuss key economic issues -such as international trade, resource management, labour force trends, and so on. Economic issues concerning women have been on the agenda since 1985.

The paper introduced by the Directorate contained several thrusts. The first thrust stated that the integration of work and family responsibilities requires the organization of society in such a way that men and women are able to be full-time members of the paid labour force while fulfilling family and community responsibilities. The second general thrust involved dual perspectives. One is that we have to assist people who work to care for their families and the second is we have to help people with family responsibilities to be able to take advantage of labour force opportunities, training opportunities and to participate in the work place. The point is to provide options to people so that the choice is up to the individual and the family.

At the 1987 conference, the ministers agreed to adopt the seven principles on work and family responsibilities that were set out in our paper. They are as follows:

Number 1: The family is an institution and the workplace and society as a whole will benefit economically and socially from improving the integration of work and family responsibilities.

Number 2: Governments can demonstrate leadership in this area by assisting workers in balancing their work and home obligations.

Number 3: Women's increased and permanent participation in the paid workforce will benefit society.

Number 4: Women have the right to participate *equally* in the paid workforce.

Number 5: Workers *with* family responsibilities should have the same access to career opportunities as workers *without* family responsibilities.

Number 6: Single-parent households should be recognized as families requiring specific initiatives that will afford them the same opportunities as two-parent families.

Number 7: Flexibility in the workplace should be consistent with job security and equitable treatment for workers.

The First Ministers directed each provincial Minister Responsible for Women's Issues to use these seven principles as a blueprint for a concrete strategy, that would address the harmonization of work and family life. Those strategies will be tabled at the next First Ministers' conference, recently postponed as a result of the election.

At this point, we have won a commitment from each province to focus on this initiative. But before I tell you about the Ontario Government's own performance to date, let me touch on a few of the reasons behind the provincial government's interest in this issue.

I think it is important to understand that when the government focuses on this issue, it is taking into acount the broader economic implications.
You already know about the changing demographics that are revolutionizing the workforce — that the labour pool is shrinking; that this trend is expected to continue; that the number of working women is on the increase; (not just because women need to work to support themselves and their families but because the economy will need to tap this labour pool to remain competitive); that the *majority* of workers have dependent care responsibilities.

From the government's standpoint, then, promoting harmony between work and family lives is a way to improve the health of the entire economy. By finding ways to harmonize the work/family interface, to more evenly spread the responsibilities of both work and home we will reduce stress, increase productivity and allow all of us to carry both our work and family responsibilities more effectively.

We also have to look at the impact that the increasing entry of women into the workforce has had on community organizations and the voluntary sector generally. There is a lack of resources available in the

community to nurture the kinds of social and community life that have traditionally depended on women who did not participate in the paid work force. I think that the harmonization of work and family responsibilities can even be broadened to talk about the harmonization of work, family and community responsibilities.

More and more corporate organizations and more and more government organizations are recognizing again the societal good of supporting community agencies. More and more corporations, for example, have people who are seconded to lead their United Way campaigns or to work in the community directly. That kind of role is really necessary, not only to make sure that those community organizations survive but that they survive also to provide the supports necessary to working families.

More and more studies are showing that if workers are able to achieve a balance between their work and family lives they are more productive, not only because they do not have to worry about what is happening to their sick parent or their child, but also there is an increased loyalty and motivation among employees to the employers who recognize their needs as people. There is less employee turnover, which means reduced costs for training and recruitment. Employee employment equity and career development plans are made more effective. Employers can draw upon workers with family responsibilities as well as those without, for challenging positions.

If the workplace enables a family to more effectively exercise a responsibility for caring for family members we may reduce some of health and social service costs. The cost to the economy occasioned by stress related illnesses and drug and alcohol abuse is decreased. When workers are free to concentrate on their work, productivity and efficiency is increased.

At the same time we can provide better care for our children and our elderly. Single parents are better able to support themselves and their dependents economically and emotionally. The long-term benefits of this are substantial.

Now, let me move on to Ontario's efforts to date on this issue.

CURRENT GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES

A moment ago, I outlined the seven principles that are the foundation for government action. But the challenge, of course, is to translate those principles into a practical, workable framework.

Our first step was to form a committee of over a dozen ministries chaired by the Ontario Women's Directorate. This interministerial committee developed a strategy which will be tabled at the next First Ministers' conference. The strategy sets out very specific goals to achieve integration of work and family responsibilities and identifies policy and program priorities that will promote this aim.

The strategy includes a review of the human resource policies of the Ontario Public Service and an investigation of the accessibility of government services and programs. It also focusses on the need for more research, public education and other action outside the halls of government.

While the committee is finding plenty of room for improvement, it has also spotlighted existing programs that are promoting an integrated approach to work and family.

* For instance, the Government of Ontario has employer-supported workplace child care at eleven separate locations with plans for more.

* The Ontario Public Service has been counselling family members who will be affected when certain ministries relocate to other parts of the province.

* The Ontario Womens' Directorate has launched demonstration projects that provide case studies of effective work and family programs within the private sector, to act as catalysts for other employees.

* In the area of child care — aside from the substantial work that the Ministry of Community and Social Services does in this area to provide accessible, affordable, quality child care, all new elementary schools are now required to make provisions for on-site child care centres. The Ministry of Skills Development offers special support allowances for trainees with family responsibilities.

* Respite care is available to care givers in the home and there are many community based services available to the elderly, disabled, etc.

These are all examples of a responsiveness to workers' needs that we would like to see throughout the government, and throughout Ontario communities.

If the government is to be a role model of this issue — and indeed,

we intend it to be — it also has to be aware of services, programs and policies that are *not* responding to the realities of Ontario's workers.

We have to ask ourselves whether existing or new policies and programs enhance, impede or are neutral to the harmonization of work and family responsibilities - sometimes policies may both enhance and impede different aspects of these responsibilities.

For example, we cannot take people out of institutions and return them to their homes without providing back-up care to help out the families that are assuming responsibility for them. We cannot provide service to the public that is strictly nine-to-five, five days a week. We cannot introduce initiatives that will only work if one member of the family is at home full-time.

In other words, we have an obligation to demonstrate, on every level, our commitment and respect for the demands of work and family.

At this point I would like to address some of the dilemmas that face us in government as we debate the issues surrounding work and family integration.

CURRENT POLICY ISSUES

In our own work on this issue we are constantly reminded of the need to reconcile a variety of competing interests.
Let me outline a few of the questions we are trying to answer and the choices that are open to us.

First and foremost we have to define the role that government can take.

Let us start with what it *cannot* do.

I think it is essential to remember that the government, after all, is limited in its authority. Theoretically, we could instantly produce an enlightened workplace and an enlightened society, with a wave of our legislative wand.

But legislation would not be the answer here. You cannot legislate changes in attitude and behavior. Government can influence these ingredients — but it cannot dictate them.

Similarly, government is not going to be able to act on this issue by throwing handfuls of money at it. The financial resources, quite frankly, just are not there. Any funding of support measures will be tempered by the need to balance the budget, to exercise fiscal responsibility — to justify every dollar spent.

And our discussion of government responsibility on such an issue must not ignore the simple realities of how government works.
From my perspective as a bureaucrat, I can pass along one useful maxim about he making of government policy: it never happens in a vacuum. Government policy emerges through consensus. It is a consultative process that relies on the input of business, labour, and the community. And it tries to reflect the needs of each of these sectors.
Now that I have set out some of the ground rules that restrict us, let us talk about the role we *can* take — and the options that are available.

Clearly, the government's role will be that of a partner. The partnership, of course, will include business, labour, the community and the families and workers themselves.

I also believe that we will be catalysts for change among all three of these players. Because while we cannot issue ultimatums, it certainly lies within our power to *influence*.

But along with these roles, the government will also want to — and is obliged to — examine any proposed solutions from a broad-based perspective. We have to avoid a bandaid strategy, or an approach that satisfies one problem, only to create another.

Another concern is flexible working ararangements, such as part-time work. With such choices, employees can balance their jobs and families more easily. But, let us look at the flip side. So far, it is primarily women who take advantage of this option. And that undermines their economic standing.

Part-time work, for instance, is not normally unionized. Women's incomes are lowered significantly. Working part-time also slows down their career progress, and traps women in their traditional, caregiving roles.

The government has to apply the same scrutiny to their societal concerns.
Our health-care system, as we all know, is dangerously overburdened. The trend now is to take the elderly out of institutions and return them to their families and communities. It is an avenue that may allow us to cut down on costs, while ensuring more personalized care.

But we also have to accommodate the modern family, where there is rarely someone at home all day to provide care to an aging relative, or to volunteer in the community. And as the baby boom starts to

swell our elderly population, it will be increasingly urgent to come up with remedies to this situation that address the entire range of its complexities.

I think you can appreciate the need to understand the full economic and social impact of issues like these. It is not enough to look for quick-and-dirty fixes. We have to look at these questions from every angle — and then work out the best possible answers.

Let me describe some of the options available to government:

First, the government can become a *role model* as an employer. Earlier I touched on a few of the programs, for example, that are now being offered to enhance the integration of work and family needs. By assisting its own employees and ensuring that the public has access to its services, the government can present an example to employers and the community at large.

Second, the government could make *direct expenditures* to establish work and family programs. It might finance more centres for child care or elder care, for instance.

Third, we could design *incentives* that would encourage employers to set up support mechanisms for their workers. The Ontario Women's Directorate now works with private-sector companies in order to develop innovative demonstration projects. The projects focus on promoting women's workplace status and flexible working arrangements are one of the areas being explored.

We could also consider financial incentives for employers, such as tax breaks or cost-sharing, to shape programs that help employees maintain productivity at work while fulfilling their at-home duties.

Fourth, there is the tool of *public education*. By increasing awareness in the community about the need for balance between work and family, we can start to change attitudes and assumptions, and encourage action. Conferences like this one are an excellent example of such communications efforts.

For example the Employment Standards Act is under review for changes that might enhance the harmonization of work and family responsibilities. We have already passed pay equity legislation, designed to improve women's economic status.

Finally, there is the option of *legislation*. While it would not be appropriate to regard legislation as the total answer to this issue, it could be *one* measure among many.

As we have seen, this issue is one in which *partnership* is the key. If we are going to be able to meet the challenge of the modern family, if we are going to assist Canadians in meshing their work and family commitments — we must rely on a collaborative strategy.

We know that society as a whole has a lot to gain by accepting this challenge. It has been shown that when employers support their workers' family needs, workplace productivity is increased and morale and loyalty are also boosted.

As competition escalates in the labour market it is going to beeven more important for the corporate world to build up human capital. Programs that stress employee satisfaction will be one important way to protect that investment in people. There are also significant benefits for the community. If employees are not overloaded with the stress of combining work with family demands they are healthier and happier.

In addition, they are more likely to make a contribution to their communities through volunteer activities. That participation strengthens all our institutions: religious, cultural, social and educational.

From the standpoint of government, our international competitive position will be sharpened if men and women have equal training and employment opportunities. It will allow us to cope better with changing demographics and a changing labour force. The costs of health and social services may be reduced when families have options which allow them to participate more in the care of our elderly and disabled populations.

It makes sound economic sense to put support mechanisms in place that will allow all of our workers to balance their jobs and their families.

As you now know first-hand, it will not happen unless we win the co-operation of all the players — government, labour, employers, community organizations, families and the workers themselves. We have to build alliances and work together to design solutions that meet everyone's needs.

That is going to require the involvement of all sectors of society — including our non-profit organizations, our service-providers and caregivers, our educators and community

network of people committed to this single agenda.

What we are talking about in this conference is a new concern for our society and there simply are not any ready-made answers at our disposal. We are in new territory. We have to explore it by pooling our resources.

In your professional roles you are providing advice and ideas that can serve to influence government decisions. I urge you to continue participating and commenting on our performance, because the progress that we will make is dependent on full participation. This conference is focusing on a fascinating challenge for *society as a whole.*

The onus is on all of us to respond to that challenge — as individuals, as professionals, as family members, and as representatives of our communities.

We are being asked to make a contribution to an issue that will improve the quality of life for each and every one of us. I think it is an exciting prospect — and I hope you will continue to contribute.

Naomi Alboim is Assistant Deputy Minister, Ontario Women's Directorate, Government of Ontario.

FLEXIBLE LEAVE POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Monica Townson

agencies, because we need a broad First, let me congratulate the School of Early Childhood Education and the Continuing Education Division of Ryerson for sponsoring this conference on Work and Family Life. I am convinced that this subject is one of the most important social policy issues of our times.

I believe that the search for a balanced integration of work and family life is crucial to the future of Canadian society. Unless we can resolve some of the conflicts that parents, both women and men, now face in trying to juggle their paid employment with their family responsibilities, serious consequences for our society will result.

I do not think that is putting it too strongly. It is my view that many of our policy-makers and business people still have not begun to take seriously the crisis that we face. That became clear to me last year when I was working on a study,for the Women's Bureau of Labour Canada, on leave for employees with family responsibilities. Part of that study involved surveying employers and trade unions to get their views on this important subject.

Many employers told me they did not feel it was an issue. Few employees ever asked for such leave. Then I found out that whether or not an employee could take time off for family responsibiltiies was generally left to the discretion of the employee's immediate supervisor. What mother whose child is ill is going to tell the supervisor and risk being turned down for a day off to make arrangements for the care of that child? I am sure it will come as no surprise to you to hear that most employees who need time off for family responsibilities use their own personal sick leave or vacation time rather than reveal they need temporary time off to care for their families. As a result, most employers have no idea how much leave their employees need, or are taking, to deal with their family responsibilities.

Responses I received from trade unions were also rather interesting. When we spoke to predominantly male trade unions, like the construction workers, about the priority they put on work and family responsibilities, they said, "Why are you calling us, we do not have any women members." Clearly, for a good many people, "family responsibilities" are something only women have. Many other unions were so preoccupied with job security and other issues that combining work with family responsibilities was not something that ranked high on their agendas.

Yet there is evidence that the difficulties workers face in trying to cope with a paid job in the work force and a family at home is starting to have an impact on the "bottom line" that employers consider so important. One major chartered bank told me recently of the high rates of absenteeism among women with young children. I do not think it would be unreasonable to assume that low employee morale, high absenteeism and low productivity will result if workers are worried about their child care arrangements, or if they have no right to take time off if a child is ill, or if there are inadequate arrangements for parental leave.

The changing nature of work and family life has intensified public pressure for effective policies that will help workers to combine their paid employment with their family responsibilities. Traditionally, we have relied on women in the home to act as primary caregivers for the young, the elderly, the sick and disabled family members. However, as more and more women have joined the paid labour force, support systems for modern families must evolve as an alternative to the old ways of doing things.

TACKLING THE PROBLEM

Major changes in family structure are of relatively recent origin. It is only within the past ten or fifteen years that Canada has witnessed the demise of the so-called "traditional family", the one-earner couple where father was the breadwinner and mother stayed at home as full-time homemaker. There are now almost as many single-parent families, most of them headed by women, as there are "traditional" families. Most Canadian children are now being raised in families where both parents work outside the home.

These developments are common to many industrialized countries. Some of these countries have developed extensive programs of support for parents who must combine paid employment with family responsibilities. Such programs may include maternity

leave following the birth of a child, extended maternity or parental leave to enable mothers or fathers to care for a child still in infancy and child care leave and special rights for parents to care for very young children who are not yet old enough to go to nursery school.

Some countries have also adopted special provisions for working parents so they can spend more time with their young children on an ongoing basis. For example, in addition to six months' paid leave following the birth of a child, the Swedish parental insurance program includes a special parental allowance that effectively lets either parent take a further six months' paid leave to care for a young child. The leave may be taken in the form of shorter working hours with no loss of pay (a six-hour working day or half-days off) that may be taken at any time up to and including the child's first year at school at the age of eight.

But, as the federal Task Force on Child Care in its 1986 report pointed out, the responsibilities of child-rearing impose continuous demands on working parents. Children get sick, for instance, and parents may have to stay at home with them from time to time. Appointments with the dentist, the doctor, or specialists may also mean the parent taking time off work. Parents whose children are in school may have to meet with their child's teachers on a regular basis to review progress.

For some workers, family responsibilities may include not only the care of dependent children but of elderly or disabled adult family members. Trends in long-term care for the elderly are now moving towards community living. There is an increasing emphasis on the desirability of caring for the elderly in their own homes, or at the very least within their own communities, supported by a network of services.

Community support services are still not well developed and the women who in the past have been expected to shoulder the burden of this kind of care are now themselves employed outside the home. If community living and family-based care for the elderly and people with disabilities are to become a reality, better support systems for families will be imperative.

Over the past year or two, a good deal of attention has been focused on child care. While free trade pre-empted a full discussion of the federal child care policy during the recent election campaign, it is a safe bet that pushing through the new child care legislation will be a priority when the new Parliament gets down to work.

I could probably spend the next hour telling you what I think are the inadequacies of the policy that has been put forward by the federal government. In my view, the proposed child care act, which is to replace the current funding of child care through the Canada Assistance Plan, will do little to address the severe crisis in child care for Canadian families.

Today, I want to focus on leave policies: maternity, paternity, parental and adoption leaves, and special leave policies for employees with family responsibilities. To my mind, such policies are an essential part of the support systems Canada needs for its families.

Parental leave of various types has perhaps tended to get overlooked in the fight for a national, publicly-funded child care system. I would argue that we cannot consider one without the other. That was brought home to me quite forcefully recently when I was making a presentation on child care policy at a conference. We were discussing infant care and someone in the group pointed out that many mothers would like to be able to stay home with their children for at least the first year of life.

If we had a fully-paid parental leave program, of course, they would be able to do that. We could even set it up in such a way that fathers could take part of the responsibility for caring for their newborn children too. In fact, I think we have to design all our programs for families on the assumption that in a two-parent family, parenting should be a shared responsibility and not something that only mothers are expected to do.

Sharing of family responsibilities is essential if women are to achieve equality in the workplace and in society. Legislation must make it possible for fathers to be involved in the care and nurturing of their children.

It is clear that child care policy has to be integrated with parental leave programs. We cannot discuss child care for infants, for example, without taking into consideration what sort of leave the parents of

infants are entitled to. If we are thinking about developing child care arrangements for children when they are ill, we need to look at whether parents have the right to take any time off when a child is sick.

THE CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS

Why does Canada need parental leave programs and leave for workers with family responsibilities? The answer is obvious if we look at the statistics. We are all familiar with the dramatic increases in the labour force participation of women. Since the 1960's, women have been entering the work force in ever-increasing numbers. Almost 54% of adult women (that is those over 25) are now in the work force, compared with only 31% twenty years ago. The most dramatic changes have been in the labour force participation of married women. In the early 1950's, only 11% of married women worked outside their homes. By 1987 more than 57% of married women were in the paid work force.

When the 1961 Census of Population was taken, 65% of all Canadian families were what has usually been thought of as the "traditional" family with only one wage-earner. Twenty years later, when the 1981 Census was taken, husband-and-wife families where the husband was the only breadwinner accounted for only 16% of all families in Canada.

These numbers do not tell the whole story. There are now very marked differences between women of different generations. Those now under 45 are following quite different work patterns from the previous generation of women, who fit what has often been considered the traditional pattern for women.

Most married women in the earlier generation, who are now in the age group 45-64, left the work force when they married or when their first child was born, and remained at home as full-time homemakers while their children were young. That is what society expected them to do. The typical woman in this generation had four children, so, many women in this age group spent quite a lot of time outside the paid work force.

Women in the next generation are clearly following quite a different lifetime work pattern. Now, most women who will have children are in the paid work force. Most do not drop out when their children are born to spend long years at home as homemakers.

For one thing, women are having fewer children. The fertility rate has dropped to only 1.67 children per woman. Societal expectations are different too. Married women generally no longer feel under pressure to remain at home to care for husband and children. Economic constraints have made it essential for most families to have two incomes if they want to maintain an acceptable standard of living. More and more women are the sole support of their families. At the national level, more than 74% of all women between the ages of 20 and 44 are in the paid work force. Of all married women in the main childbearing years, that is ages 20-44, 72% work now outside their homes.

In Ontario, the rates are well above the national average. Last year, for instance, more than 77% of all Ontario women between the ages of 25 and 44 were in the paid work force. Remember that these are the main years when women are having children. For women in the age group 25-34 in Ontario last year, 77% were in the paid work force; and of those aged 35-44 in the province, nearly 78% worked outside their homes.

At the national level, 59.4% of mothers with pre-school children participated in the labour force last year. That compares with only 37.6% a decade earlier. Fifty-seven per cent of mothers with children under three worked outside their homes last year. Contrary to public perception, most mothers who work when their children are very young have full-time jobs. Sixty-nine per cent of mothers of pre-schoolers who worked for pay last year were working full-time.

These numbers highlight very dramatically why we need decent child care and paid parental leave programs. They show conclusively that most women who are likely to have children are in the paid work force. Most young children in Canada today are being raised in families where both parents work outside the home.

It may well be that more and more workers will have responsibilities to other family members besides children. We are all aware of the aging of the Canadian population; the proportion of Canada's population over 65 is increasing. Indications are, that in the future, the families of the elderly may be expected to play a bigger role in their care. Although at the moment Canada has one of the highest rates of institutionalization of the elderly in the western world, new trends in the care of the elderly are towards community living.

The same sort of trend is evident in the care of people with disabilities, where community living is now the preferred option for those who were previously

institutionalized . These trends will likely be accelerated as provincial governments, faced with ever-increasing budget deficits, attempt to cut back on spending. Some experts have suggested that current high rates of institutionalization of the elderly, for example, may be difficult to sustain from a cost point of view as the proportion of the population that is elderly increases.

In the past (and perhaps still, in the minds of some politicians) community care has meant family care and particularly care by female kin. Some groups have even suggested that incentives for them to do so should be considered, for example by providing a special pension for those (usually women) who remain outside the labour force to care for elderly or disabled relatives at home.

It seems to me it is no longer realistic to assume that the care of children, the elderly, sick and disabled family members can continue to be the responsibility of women who remain outside the work force. Given the kind of labour force participation trends I mentioned, it seems much more likely that if responsibility for care of the elderly and disabled is to fall more on their families, it will be a responsibility that will have to be undertaken by family members, both women and men, in addition to their paid employment.

WHAT KIND OF LEAVE IS NEEDED?

To help employees cope with their roles as parents, I would say that there are five main types of leave that we have to look at:

1. Mothers need maternity leave so that they can take time off work to give birth and recuperate.

2. Fathers should have paternity leave to allow them to be present at the birth of their children and perhaps for a brief period afterwards.

3. Both parents should have the right to take parental leave, that is an extended period of leave following maternity leave, available to either parent, to allow for infant care and bonding with the newborn child.

4. Parents who adopt a child should have the right to adoption leave so that they can bond with the child they are adopting and adjust to the presence of a new family member in the home.

5. Finally, there must be leave for family responsibilities. This type of leave would be given to either parent, so that they may take a few days off if a child or the child's usual caregiver is ill, or if they must deal with family emergencies, such as taking a child to the doctor or appointments with the child's teacher or child care centre. Family responsibility leave should also be availble to workers who have other dependent family members, such as a child with disabilities or an elderly parent.

We already have the statutory right to many of these leaves in Canada. But having the right to leave does not necessarily mean you will get paid while you are off work. Unless parents are compensated during time off, we are, in effect, exacting a financial penalty for parenting.
If workers who care for other dependent family members have no right to time off in emergencies, we are sending a message that says society does not really support families caring for the elderly and people with disabilities within their homes.

LEAVE PROVISIONS CURRENTLY IN PLACE IN CANADA

When it comes to the different types of parental leaves, there is incredible confusion between leave and benefits. For instance, wherever you live in Canada, unless it is in the Northwest Territories, the law gives you the right to take time off to have a baby. It does not give you the right to be paid while you are off work, but you can claim maternity benefits through the Unemployment Insurance scheme (UI).

Qualifying for maternity leave and qualifying for maternity benefits are two completely separate procedures. For instance, you can qualify for UI maternity benefits if you have worked for 20 weeks in the last year. But you may not be able to qualify for time off unless you have worked for 12 months for the same employer.

You may qualify for adoption benefits under the UI program but, depending on where you live, you may have no legal right to take adoption leave.

To make it even more confusing, you can make your own arrangements. Regardless of what the law says about your right to leave or your right to benefits, you may still be entitled to different types of maternity or parental leave, with or without pay.

Some trade unions have negotiated collective agreements with employers providing for

parental leave and benefits that are better than those specified in the law. In some cases, employers top up UI maternity benefits to provide full pay while a woman is on maternity leave. Sometimes paid parental leave is available to either parent.

Some employers have informal policies allowing time off for family responsibilities. Your right to maternity or parental leave is covered by labour standards legislation. If your employer comes under federal jurisdiction, banks, transportation, communications, and some other companies, you are covered by the Canada Labour Code. Otherwise, you come under the employment standards laws of the province in which you work.

If you work for either the federal or provincial government, you are covered by a separate public service act of the federal government or of the province or territory which employs you.

In many cases, these public service acts do not provide maternity or parental leaves. Collective agreements covering federal, provincial and territorial public servants provide for maternity, adoption and sometimes other types of leave. Management employees, not covered by the agreements, usually are given the same rights as those provided in the collective agreement.

Keep in mind that all the provisions for leave are for unpaid leave. In other words, the law says you have certain rights to take time off, but it does not say you have any right to be paid.

MATERNITY LEAVE

Except for the Northwest Territories, all provinces and territories, as well as the federal jurisdiction, provide a statutory right to unpaid maternity leave. All federal, provincial and territorial public servants also have the right to maternity leave either through collective agreements or through the separate acts covering their employment.

To qualify for leave, you may have to have worked anywhere from six months to one year plus 11 weeks, depending on where you live. The norm is 12 months of continuous employment for the same employers. In Ontario, you need 12 months and 11 weeks of continuous employment immediately preceding the estimated date of delivery to qualify for unpaid leave.

The length of the leave is usually about 17 or 18 weeks. For public servants, maternity leave varies from four months in Prince Edward Island, to 12 months in the Saskatchewan public service. In Ontario, you get 17 weeks, whether you come under employment standards legislation or you work for the Ontario government.

Most maternity leave laws say you cannot be fired for being pregnant, but sometimes job protection only applies to workers who qualify for maternity leave. If you have not worked for the employer for a full 12 months, for instance, you may be left unprotected.

Most jurisdictions require the employer to reinstate you in the same or a comparable position with the same salary and benefits when you return from maternity leave, but there is nothing in the laws to prevent an employer from firing you once you come back from maternity leave. If that happens, however, you may be protected through laws covering unjust dismissal.

Most laws on maternity leave specify how much notice you must give your employer. The law will also state when the leave must be taken. Usually, leave may begin from six to eleven weeks before the birth.

Under many provincial laws, employers have the right to require you to start your maternity leave if they can prove your pregnancy has materially affected your job performance. As an alternative, the law may also state that the employer can transfer you to a different job.

Some provinces, including Ontario, enforce a mandatory period of post-natal leave, usually about six weeks. You may have to produce a medical certificate if you want to return to work before this time is up.

PATERNITY LEAVE

There are almost no legislative provisions for paternity leave in Canada. The provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba are way ahead of all other jurisdictions on this one. Fathers in those provinces may take six weeks off on the birth of a child. Men who are covered by the Canada Labour Code (that is those who work for banks, transportation, communications and some other companies) may take parental leave. Some collective agreements provide for paternity leave, usually one or two days off, when a child is born.

PARENTAL LEAVE

Parental leave is still rare in Canada. The Canada Labour Code, covering employees under federal jurisdiction (but not federal public servants who are covered by their own separate act) now provides for 24 weeks of unpaid parental leave, available to either parent. This is in addition to the 17 weeks of maternity leave available only to the mother. If both parents want to take the parental leave, the combined total may not exceed 24 weeks.

In Saskatchewan, the paternity leave I mentioned could also be taken as a form of parental leave during the three months surrounding the expected date of birth of the child.

If you work for the federal government, you can get 26 weeks of unpaid parental leave and up to five years unpaid leave for care and nurturing of a pre-school child.

ADOPTION LEAVE

As far as adoption leave is concerned, only five provinces (Ontario is not one of them) have laws providing the right to leave on the adoption of a child for workers in the their provinces. In some cases, only mothers are entitled to the leave.

For adoptive parents under federal jurisdiction, the 24 weeks' parental leave provided in the Canada Labour Code may also be taken on the adoption of a child. All federal, provincial and territorial public servants have the right to unpaid adoption leave.

Some collective agreements in the private sector also provide for adoption leave.

LEAVE FOR EMPLOYEES WITH FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES

We have no laws anywhere in Canada that give employees the right to take time off for family responsibilities. No jurisdiction yet provides a statutory right to this kind of leave, although employees of the federal and several provincial and territorial governments now have the right to this kind of leave. In the private sector, few collective agreements include family responsibility leave. Whether or not a worker gets time off to attend to family responsibilities is often left to the discretion of the employee's immediate supervisor. In many cases, it appears that employers are willing to turn a blind eye if employees use their own sick leave entitlement or vacation time to deal with family responsibilities that come up on an emergency basis. A few employers make specific provision for employees to do this. Not many have yet provided for family responsibility leave as part of their personnel practices.

THE RIGHT TO BENEFITS

We can be as generous as we like with unpaid leave, but unless we have some way of providing a replacement income during the leave, lower income workers will not be able to take advantage of the leave provisions because they will not be able to afford to.

The federal government gives its employees the right to take up to five years unpaid leave for care and nurturing of a pre-school child. That sounds very enlightened and progressive. But what low-income parent can afford to take five years off without pay?

Even middle and upper-income parents find they cannot afford it because they have to make up their pension contributions when they return from leave. If you take five years off, the first five years you are back at work you will have to pay triple pension contributions, once for current service, once for the employee contributions you missed while you were away, and once to make up the employer contributions for the time you were on leave. All of this comes when you are faced with the additional costs of having a young child in the family, child care being probably the most expensive.

If you take maternity or adoption leave, you may be entitled to benefits under the Unemployment Insurance (UI) program. This is a social insurance program. You and your employer make contributions based on your earnings and that entitles you to claim benefits if your earnings are interrupted.

The criteria you must satisfy for UI benefits are not the same as the conditions you must meet to have the right to take time off.

Generally speaking, UI maternity benefits are available only to mothers, although in March 1988 the UI Act was changed to allow men to claim benefits if their wives die in childbirth or are otherwise unable to care for a newborn child.

There is also some discussion going on now as to whether fathers should be entitled to other benefits. That was triggered by a recent case in Ontario where a father claimed maternity benefits being available only to mothers constituted gender-based discrimination under the Charter of Rights.

To get the UI maternity or adoption benefits, you have to meet certain conditions:

1. You must have worked and contributed to UI for 20 weeks in the 52-week period before your claim.

2. If you qualify, benefits will be paid for 15 weeks, after a two-week waiting period during which you get nothing.

3. Your benefits will be equivalent to 60% of your usual earnings up to a weekly maximum. In 1988 the maximum weekly benefit is $339.

4. Because of the two-week waiting period, 15 weeks of benefits must be spread over 17 weeks of leave. For women whose earnings are at or below the maximum weekly insured limit, (that means most women), the total amount they get in maternity benefits is equivalent to only 53% of what they would have earned during the 17-week period. That means that most women are faced with a 47% drop in income when they are on maternity leave.

5. UI rules prevent you from starting a maternity benefits claim during a strike.

6. If you have already made a claim for UI sickness benefits before starting on maternity benefits, your total benefit period from both claims may not exceed 15 weeks. If you claimed sickness benfits because you were off work through illness early in the pregnancy, you will not be able to claim your full 15 weeks of maternity benefits.

7. If you earn more than a certain amount in the year (in 1988, the limit is $44,070) you may be required to pay back part of the maternity benefits received when you file your income tax return.

8. You can start your maternity benefits claim as early as eight weeks before the expected date of birth (confirmed by a medical certificate) but your benefit period must terminate within 17 weeks of the actual birth.

9. If your employer has required you to stop working prior to eight weeks before the expected date of birth, you still will not be able to claim benefits until eight weeks before.

10. Women whose babies are born prematurely and have to remain in hospital will be helped by a March 1988 change to the UI Act allowing them to receive benefits for up to 17 weeks after the baby is released from hospital instead of 17 weeks from the date of birth.

The UI program also provides for adoption benefits. When a family adopts a child, either the mother or the father may claim these benefits under UI. Even if the mother does not work outside the home, the father can still claim the benefits. The other terms and conditions of adoption benefits are the same as those for UI maternity benefits.

There is no public program of parental benefits at either the federal or provincial level, although some trade unions have negotiated agreements providing fully-paid leave following the birth of a child. In some cases, benefits may be available to fathers as well as mothers.

PAID LEAVE FOR FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES

Very few workers have paid leave for family responsibilities. Labour standards legislation for paid vacation time and paid holidays does not cover family responsibility leave. Workers who must take time off for family responsibilities usually have to use their own paid sick leave or paid vacation time. In some cases, employers recognize this is what is going on and they turn a blind eye. In other cases, the right to use your own sick leave or vacation time for family emergencies is specifically provided for in the collective agreement.

This kind of approach can be seriously detrimental to women. It is still usually the mother who is expected to care for dependent family members in emergencies. If a child is sick, mother will not want to ask for time off in case she is refused. So what does she do? She calls in sick or she tells the boss she has to take a couple of days of her vacation.

That means women workers with family responsibilities are hit with a double whammy. Not only do they have to do double duty (paid work in the work force and unpaid work in the home) but they end up with less personal sick leave and vacation time than other workers. Such penalties are hardly consistent with society's commitment to the full and equal integration of women into our national social and economic life.

HOW DOES CANADA COMPARE WITH OTHER COUNTRIES?

The short answer is not very well. Most other industrialized countries, except for the United States, have much better provisions for maternity and parental leave than Canada does.

In terms of maternity benefit levels, a study that I did for the Katie Cooke Task Force on Child Care in 1985 showed that Canada ranks 22nd out of 23 countries in eastern and western Europe. Even countries considered not as well off as Canada, such as Spain, Portugal and Italy, have better maternity benefit programs than we do. Fifteen countries pay maternity benefits of 90% to 100% of the employee's usual earnings, up to a weekly maximum, for periods ranging from six weeks to nine months.

Sweden's parental insurance program provides 29 days of maternity leave and 14 days paternity leave, plus nine months of parental leave, available to either parent, all at 90% of usual earnings. There is another three months of parental leave during which a flat rate benefit is paid, as well as shorter working hours with no loss of pay for parents with young children and paid time off for employees with family responsibilities.

Many other countries, except for the United States, provide a right to paid leave for family responsibilities.

WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE?

Some people would argue that deciding to have children or to accept the responsibility of caring for an elderly or disabled family member is a personal choice in which society in general has no part. If the result is that those who choose to undertake these responsibilities end up with less vacation or less sick leave than other members of society, then this is the penalty they must pay if they want to make that choice.

Surely it is in the interests of society as a whole that people continue to bear and care for children. Unless some members of society choose to do this, society itself would not continue. The same arguments may be made in respect of those who care for the elderly and people with disabilities.

Private care of the elderly and the disabled may become increasingly important as the elderly account for a greater percentage of the total population and as the movement toward community living for the elderly and people with disabilities increases. That being so, it surely cannot be in the interests of society to penalize those of its members who are willing to undertake the responsibility of caring for other members of society who are unable to care for themselves.

Canada, along with many other advanced industrialzed societies, has already largely accepted that children are a societal responsibility. Public education is provided free for all children on a mandatory basis, and a statutory right to maternity and parental leave is provided through the Canada Labour Code and in the statutes of all provincial jurisdictions in Canada. Unemployment insurance, which is a national program, incorporates maternity benefits so that women workers who must take time off for childbearing have some financial protection. All of these initiatives are evidence of a commitment to children and families as a societal responsibility and not just a private choice.

It is interesting that a 1981 Task Force which studied the UI program commented on the evolution of UI maternity benefits from a basis of replacement income for mothers who were physically incapacitated as a result of childbirth, to one that recognizes mothers must spend some time with their newborn children. To return to a strict physical incapacity basis for maternity benefits, said the Task Force, "would constitute a signficant step backwards in social policy. In a period in which women's labour force participation is increasing steadily, such a change would greatly reduce the income protection capacity of UI as it applies to working women."

The Task Force at that time recommended streamlining the maternity benefits program to make it more accessible to women workers. The changes, it said, "will recognize the increasing labour market contribution of women and will constitute a major step forward, both in simplifying the maternity provisions themselves and in strengthening the income protection capacity of the UI program as a whole".

Giving employees the right to take time off when there is some family emergency would be consistent with other national policies that recognize the contributions to society of parents and of caregivers to the elderly and people with disabilities. It would ensure that those who undertake this important work on behalf of society would not be penalized as a result.

EMPLOYER OPPOSITION TO LEGISLATED LEAVES

Maternity leave has been a statutory right of Canadian women for many years now. The provinces have been slow to incorporate a right to other types of parental and family leave into their statutes.

As I found out when I was doing my study for Labour Canada, employers and employer organizations do not like the idea of statutory leave provisions and they were generally opposed to a statutory provision for family responsibility leave. They believe there is more flexibility in the current system.

If an employee needs ten days off, for example, the supervisor might exercise discretion and grant the leave; if only one day is needed, then only one is taken. With a statutory provision for a specific number of days' leave, employers argue, the employee would be limited to no more than that number. As well, it is claimed, employees who are given the right to a certain number of days off per year for family responsibilities, will take that number of days off, whether they need them or not. This could increase the cost to employers.

While there may be some merit in these arguments, they have to be weighed against the need for employees to have some guarantee they will have the right to family responsibility leave when they need it, and not be dependent on the whim of the immediate supervisor. In particular, there must be some acknowledgement of the fact that requiring (or tacitly allowing) an employee to use her or his own sick leave or vacation entitlement for family responsibilities may effectively penalize women workers, who are still expected to be in the main family caregivers.

In any case, if the right to family responsibility leave were legislated, there would be nothing to prevent an employer from retaining flexibility in special cases by granting an employee more than the legislated maximum number of family responsibility leave days off if circumstances warranted it, in the way that employers now claim they do.

As to the claim that employees would take more days off than they now do if there were a statutory right to leave, it is interesting to see what happens in countries where they have that right. In Sweden employees are allowed up to 60 days per child a year for family responsibility leave. The actual amount of time taken off by parents is very much less than the maximum allowed. Parents with children under five take an average of nine days a year, those with children between nine and twelve average only four days a year.

We should remember that even under the existing system, employers generally have no way of knowing if an employee who takes one or two days of her or his vacation time, or a day off because of "illness", is actually off work because of some kind of family emergency (such as a child's illness) which is not provided for in the employer's personnel policies or in the collective agreement.

A recognition that workers with family responsibilities may need time off over and above their own sick leave or vacation time would be in the interests of employers. It would ensure that adequate personal vacation time and sick leave is provided to these workers on the same basis as all other workers. That could enable them to maintain and perhaps increase their productivity. It could also improve employee morale and potentially reduce absenteeism. Workers with family responsibilities, as we have seen, now constitute the majority of all prime age employees.

HOW LONG SHOULD THE LEAVE BE?

Employers say they are concerned that employees would take long and frequent periods of time off if they were given the right to family responsibility leave. We should not forget that an employee who takes more than two or three days' sick leave is usually required to produce a doctor's certificate as proof of illness or inability to work. An employee might also be required to produce a certificate if she or he wanted to take more than a few days off to care for some other family member.

The need for extended leave for family responsibilities is not likely to happen on a regular or predictable basis in the way that short-term family emergencies do. Just the same, it may eventually be feasible to guarantee a longer period of unpaid leave by statute.

In any case, employer concerns about granting the right to family responsibility leave may be misplaced. The way I would define "family responsibility leave" would be leave to deal with short-term family emergencies, and it would only amount to one or two days at a time. In fact, provisions for this kind of leave in the federal public service permits a maximum of five days in any fiscal year, but not more than two consecutive days may be taken at any one time for the temporary care of a sick family member. The intention is, that if the family member will require longer-term care, the employee will be able to use the days off to make arrangements for such care.

SHOULD IT BE LEFT TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING?

Although few unions have negotiated family responsibility leave clauses in their collective agreements, some people might argue that unions are free to bargain for such clauses if they feel the need for them. While that may be true, it is also important to note that few women in the work force (and a minority of male workers too) are members of trade unions.

Trade unions have led the way in developing other measures such as maternity benefits, parental leave, shorter working hours and minimum wages. These are measures which have subsequently been adopted as national policies or programs accessible to all workers. Ultimately, national programs must be adopted if all workers are to benefit. Even if all unions were to insist on family responsibility leave clauses in their contract and employers were to agree to these demands, the majority of women (and even the majority of men) who are not members of trade unions would not benefit.

If we accept a societal responsibility to acknowledge the contribution of workers with family responsibilities, both to the economy and to society, a strong case can be made for implementing a statutory right to leave, rather than leaving the development of this measure to collective bargaining. The best approach would probably be to set minimum standards for leave in employment standards legislation, and then for unions to augment that standard for their members through the collective bargaining process. This is the approach that has been taken with maternity benefits where some unions have negotiated an employer top-up to UI maternity benefits that results in fully-paid maternity or parental leave for members.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS FOR FAMILY RESPONSIBILITY LEAVE

All in all, it would appear that statutory provisions for family responsibility leave would give protection to employees; would remove the penalty that now exists for workers (and especially women workers) with family responsibilities, and could result in benefits to employers in the form of improved employee morale, enhanced productivity and perhaps reduced absenteeism.

If the right to leave is to be guaranteed by statute, provision could be made in the Canada Labour Code and in the employment standards legislation of the various provinces. The leave could be paid or unpaid. Models for both types of leave are currently to be found in labour standards legislation.

For example, all jurisdictions provide for unpaid maternity or parental leave following the birth of a child, and some provinces also provide for paternity and/or adoption leave. Finally, responsibility leave might be seen as an adjunct to this type of leave and provisions could be made as an extension to the types of parental leave already covered under the legislation. It could be made clear that such leave would be available not only in the case of dependent children, but also where the employee had to attend to the needs of an elderly or disabled family member.

An alternative would be to treat family responsibility leave in the same way as annual vacations with pay or general holidays. In this case, the employee would be entitled to a certain number of paid days off each year for family responsibilities, which would be defined in the legislation.

A COURSE OF ACTION

What needs to be done to help Canadian workers combine their paid employment with their family responsibilities? We need to improve both the right to leave and the right to benefits. These steps are essential to help parents with young children combine paid employment with family responsibilities. I would like to suggest an eight-step program:

1. Bring the provincial and territorial employment standards legislation into line with the Canada Labour Code. That would give all parents in Canada the right to 2 weeks of parental leave, following the 17 weeks of maternity leave that is already available in all jurisdictions, (except the Northwest Territories), for mothers. The Northwest Territories would enact the right to both maternity and parental leave in its Employment Standards Act.

As a longer-term strategy, we could work to get this statutory right to leave extended to one year, including the 17 weeks that would be reserved for mothers only to allow for recuperation from childbirth.

2. Make sure that those provinces that do not already have it, include adoption leave in their employment standards laws.

3. Provide for paternity leave so that fathers have the right to leave

on the birth of a child. That means amending labour standards legislation in all jurisdictions except Saskatchewan and Manitoba, which already have this type of leave, and I am talking about leave of more than a day or two.

4. Amend the labour standards laws at the federal and provincial levels to provide the right to several days of paid time off each year for employees with family responsibilities. My suggestion here would be five days per year per child or dependent family member. In this case, the employer would be required to give the time off with pay, in the same way as employers are required to give holidays with pay under the labour codes.

For those employers who think that is too much, let us just make them aware of the experience of Sweden. Being granted the right to a number of days of family responsibility leave a year does not mean that employees will necessarily abuse that right.

5. Adjust the UI program. The two-week waiting period for UI maternity benefits should be abolished; benefits should not be affected by labour disputes; the limit of 15 weeks combined sickness and maternity benefits should be lifted. These are changes that have been recommended by all sorts of task forces and commissions and they should be implemented right away.

6. Extend and expand the current UI maternity benefits program so that the benfit periods match the provisions for unpaid leave in the labour codes. That would mean that in addition to 17 weeks of maternity benefits we now have, there should be another 24 weeks of parental benefits.

7. As a longer-term strategy, increase maternity and parental benefits so that workers who take these leaves are provided with full replacement income up to a weekly maximum. What would it cost? When I did the calculations for my study for the Cooke Task Force in 1985, I estimated we could have a fully-paid parental leave program, offering 2 weeks of benefits at 85% of salary up to a weekly maximum, for an increased cost of roughly between 97 cents and $1.24 a week per employee at most for employee contributions and between $1.33 and $1.75 a week per employee at most for employer contributions.

These rates apply to someone earning at or above the maximum weekly insurable earnings. For workers whose earnings are below average, such as those working at minimum wage, the increase in contributions would be less. The highest contribution rate assumes that the federal government would not contribute at all to the cost of the program, which is the way it operates now. If the government were to contribute say 15% or 25% of the cost, then we would not need to increase the employer-employee contribution rates as much. The lower estimates of contribution rate increases reflect this option.

Just one final point on strategy. We have seen a few changes to the UI program lately to give benefits to men. We may see more in the future because some men are challenging a program that gives benefits to mothers and not to fathers. Human rights principles recognize that rights cannot be granted to one group by taking them away from another. Where men are granted the right to paternity or parental benefits, it must not be done by reducing the length of maternity leave or the amount of the benefits currently available to mothers. That I believe is crucial.

THE POTENTIAL FOR CHANGE

Are we going to see these changes made? Unless we make it a clear priority for social policy in this country, I think it is unlikely we will see any action. As you know, we have already had a detailed inquiry into the Unemployment Insurance Program. After the controversial report of the Forget Commission into unemployment insurance, the government decided it would make no changes to the UI program at this time. In my opinion, that is why there was no mention of paid parental leave as part of the so-called national child care strategy.

The government's reluctance to open up the UI program meant that even those minor housekeeping changes that I mentioned could not be accomplished. It also meant that there was no discussion about establishing parental benefits or bringing UI maternity benefits into line with the maternity and parental leave provisions that are already in the Canada Labour Code.

My concern now is that the UI program may well be opened up, but for the purpose of cutting back benefits. That was the major recommendataion of the Forget Commission. Now I think we can expect to see pressure from the business community to reopen the debate.

It is not at all clear to me that we can even consider new national programs of leave or benefits given the free trade agreement and

the Meech Lake Accord. Those who have looked at how these two measures may interact have not been optimistic about the future of social programs and policies in this country.

Why should we have a public program of paid parental leave? The social justification for it is very much the same as that for publicly-funded child care. Children are a societal responsibility. If we want our society to continue, we have to make sure that parents have the kind of support systems they need to bear and raise the next generation of Canadians.

The fertility rate is now the lowest it has ever been, and it is well below the replacement rate. In the province of Quebec, the rate is only 1.43 children per woman, and that is about the lowest in the western world. Politicians in that province are now so concerned that in a recent Quebec budget, the provincial government proposed a substantial financial payment to women who would have a third child. What woman is going to decide to make a commitment to 15 or 20 years of raising a child on the basis of being paid a few thousand dollars when the child is born?

It seems to me we have to start looking at the connection between declining fertility rates and the lack of support for parents with children.

It would even be in the interests of employers to make sure those support systems are in place. Most prime-age workers these days, whether they are women or men, are also parents with family responsibilities. Let me repeat, unless employers are willing to help these workers to combine their paid employment with the family responsibilities, those employers are going to find themselves up against poor employee morale, high absenteeism and low productivity. Those are all things that affect that famous "bottom line" that employers seem to care so much about.

The case against public programs to support parents, such as publicly-funded child care and paid parental leave, is put forward very vocally by those who believe that having children is a private choice and that people who make that choice must live with the consequences. I believe that is a very short-sighted approach to take.

It has always seemed ironic to me that policy-makers and politicians who claim to be "pro-family" should offer so little support in public policy for families, and indeed that they should put so many obstacles in the way of families.

Canadian society today actually penalizes families with children. As we have seen, a mother who takes maternity leave faces a 47% drop in her income while she is getting UI maternity benefits.

When she goes back to work, she has no statutory right to take a day off if her child is ill, unless she is lucky enough to work for the federal government, which is the only employer in Canada to have a comprehensive policy on family responsibility leave. As we know only too well, quality, affordable child care will probably not be available to the mother (or father) with young children either.
For a society that claims to be "pro-family" we have a very strange way of translating that support for families into policies and programs. It is my view that Canada's unwillingness to offer real and meaningful support to families with children reflects our society's ambivalence about the changed role of women. Even though all our statistics show the extent of the changes, there are still those in influential policy-making positions who refuse to acknowledge it.

Our refusal to provide adequate public funding for child care and to implement paid parental leave programs, I suspect is for many people, a way of penalizing women who go to work outside their homes instead of remaining at home as dutiful, full-time wives and mothers. What these people overlook, of course, is that it is the children and their families who are penalized because they are denied access to the services and programs they need.

Would it not be better to acknowledge that the changes in women's work force participation are permanent and unlikely to be reversed? We know that as far as child care is concerned, we have to base our policies on the assumption that the majority of families with young children need decent affordable child care and that this must be provided for them as a public service, in the same way as health and education now are.

Paid parental leave must be part of that package. We also have to start looking at flexible work time options for parents. Although that is beyond the scope of what I have been trying to address here today, I think it is an important part of

helping workers to combine their employment and their family life.

I am not in favour of some of the options that seem popular with certain policy-makers. Proposals for part-time work and job sharing overlook the fact that sharing a job means sharing a salary and that is something that many families cannot afford to do. We need to challenge the way paid employment is structured.

We have set up our workplace to fit a model of that so-called traditional family, where one parent, usually the mother, was always at home doing the housework and caring for the children. That model does not fit anymore. Let us not waste any more time longing for the old days where we did not have to face these problems. Let us look upon the changes as a challenge: a challenge to redefine work and the workplace to fit the needs of today's families. Let us start looking at options like the shorter work-week (with no loss of pay) that would allow fathers as well as mothers to spend more time with their children on an ongoing basis.

The kind of changes I would like to see will not happen overnight. But I believe strongly that we have to start working towards them now. If business is so concerned about its bottom line, we need to make sure employers understand the importance of human resources in that all-important calculation. We also need to make sure that employers understand the benefits that would flow from helping workers to combine paid employment with family responsibilities.

As the newly-elected politicians take their seats in Ottawa, we can make our views known to them too. If the politicians really do care about the family, as they so often claim, we have to make sure that they demonstrate their commitment by implementing the kind of policies we need to support parents and children.

Monica Townson is an Economist, with Monica Townson and Associates, Inc., Ottawa

LABOUR AND MANAGEMENT: IN SEARCH OF EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS

Paula Rusak and Larry Steinberg

Paula Rusak

There are very few initiatives, in respect of the integration of work and family, which are taking place at the negotiating table. I think the reasons for this are many. Some of them, I think, are because the integration of work and family is still being seen very much as a woman's problem. Since unions tend to be male dominated there is very little focus on these kinds of issues at the bargaining table.

I think another reason why there are not that many of these initiatives at the bargaining table is because, to a very large extent in Ontario, the government has been forced, maybe through pressure from lobby groups be they union lobby groups or women's groups, to implement certain initiatives like maternity leave, adoption leave, etc. Consequently, with legislation like the Employment Standards Act or the Human Rights Code, Occupational Health and Safety Act, there are not that many initiatives for the union then to have to bargain at the table.

There may be other reasons but those are basically some of the reasons that I see for not being faced with many of these initiatives at the table. Having said this, however, I would like to point out that where initiatives do appear in a collective agreement, they are more likely to be found in collective agreements which deal with employees who work in the public sector. That is, initiatives in collective agreements will be found where the government is the employer.

Another sector where you may find what we could call initiatives in collective agreements is where the government does not appear to be the employer on the surface, but is in fact the employer; (the silent "partner" or ghost at the negotiating table) because it is the government who ultimately funds the particular institution. I am referring to things like hospitals, nursing homes, many other public agencies, police and fire departments.

In those situations, if you look at some of the collective agreements, you will find what looks like initiatives. You will find better maternity leave provisions than you would find in an industrial collective agreement. You may find adoption leave, marriage leave and various things like that. But I would suggest that the reason you will find that in those collective agreements is not because the union or management took an initiative. I would suggest that in many cases the reason you will find provisions like that in those collective agreements is because all of those employers, if they cannot resolve their dispute at the bargaining table, must go to arbitration and ultimately the issues are imposed by a third party, an interest arbitrator.

In the private sector, manufacturing and other industry, where the parties cannot agree to things at the negotiating table, the only recourse the employees have is to either accept the employer's offer or go out on strike. Where you have the interest arbitration situation, the arbitrator is not ultimately footing the bill so they tend to be a little more generous and they tend to trade off issues at the arbitration hearing.

In the private sector, my own experience has been that the union in negotiations may very well propose paid maternity leave, paid adoption leave, etc. But on the other hand, on behalf of the employer, I say we cannot afford it; the cost is horrendous. Pretty early on in the negotiations those issues are dropped and the union is quite prepared to accept the minimum standards which are either in the Employment Standards Act or other legislation.

If, on the other hand, they are not willing to accept it they can go out on strike. But I am certainly not aware of any strikes where the sole issue has been what can be classified as a family or quality of life issue and employees have actually gone out on strike for that sole issue.

Larry Steinberg

No employer in their right mind will easily give paternity leave benefits beyond what the legislation requires or maternity leave benefits or adoption benefits. It is very simple —it costs money, it is inconvenient and it affects scheduling. In my experience, none of the issues we have been talking about here were significant enough to be pushed to an impasse, to a strike, or were significant enough that they formed anything more than a statement of principle from the point of view of the union movement.

A good example is that the Ontario Federation of Labour is holding their meeting this week and there are some 'family issues' that have been put on the table. I will be very surprised if the past pattern is broken at all and that there are any major breakthroughs that take place. What is clear to me as a general principle is that it is government really that has been leading the way, and that collective bargaining has been following along willing to accept, by and large, minimum standards provided by the legislation and in some cases bargaining for more. But, very unevenly. Very large employers, for example, public sector or quasi-public sector employers have been willing to go beyond.

I deal, for example, quite a bit with the Post Office which is a very large employer which has many benefits. If you are a postal employee the benefits that you have in respect to maternity leave, adoption leave, paternity leave and things like that are very, very generous. I have other clients who work for small manufacturing concerns who have nothing other than what legislation provides in terms of U.I. benefits and leave, nor the clout to get it, nor an employer who is very willing to part with the dollars to provide it.

The other interesting thing is that there are only two men here sitting in on an issue that deals with work and the add-on is the 'family' as well. It is perceived to be a woman's issue. That is just not right! That is a problem that concerns unions, employers and government. I think we still have a long way to go both in terms of Paula's clients and my clients in developing and pushing these issues forward.

Having said that, let me address briefly the questions of paternity leave, maternity leave and adoption in the legal context. There are two concepts everyone has to understand in order to appreciate, at least from a legislative point of view, what has taken place: 1) 'leave entitlement for maternity, paternity or adoption purposes' that is, protection of one's job, and 2) whether you get paid for the period of time you are off with your leave.

The trouble we have in Canada is that aside from employees who work in federal concerns and in the federal sphere, leave protection, that is, laws that protect people who take time off to have or rear children, are a provincial responsibility and are normally governed by the relevant provincial Employment Standards Act. The payment of benefits, to the extent that they are covered by legislation, have been dealt with in this country at the federal level through the Unemployment Insurance Act. That creates certain anomilies and difficulties in terms of co-ordinating the legislation and in terms of providing a social safety net in these types of situations. For example, while you are entitled, under the Unemployment Insurance Act, to benefits when you adopt a child, you are not protected under our Employment Standards Act in Ontario. If I adopt a child and go to my employer and say I would like some time off, that employer has every right to say to me, "That's fine, you go, but there is no job for you when you come back". There is no requirement that the job remain.

That is difficult when you are adopting a child because there are requirements in most adoption legislation that if you adopt a child you cannot just take the child and bring in a nanny or babysitter. You have to spend a certain period of time with the child; I think in Ontario it is six months. As an adoptive parent you have the dilemma where your job is not protected and yet, by law, you have to spend some time with the child. There is a different legislation tending to pull in different directions and it creates serious dilemmas for most working people.

There has been some recent court activity dealing with maternity benefits. There is a recent case just decided involving the relationship of Section 30 of the Unemployment Insurance Act, the section providing for maternity benefits, to the Charter of Rights. A Toronto lawyer who works for the Ontario Nurses' Association, Mr. Schacter, and his wife had a child and they wanted to share in the initial period of child rearing after the child was born. In addition, his wife wanted to return to work early. He applied for maternity benefits and was denied because the clear language of Section 30 of the Unemployment Insurance Act says it is only available to women. He brought an action in the Federal Court of Canada claiming that Section 30 was in violation of the Charter and, in particular, in violation of the equality right provision of the Charter which provides that everyone has equal benefit of the law. The provision, Section 30, was struck down by the court.

How has collective bargaining dealt with work and family matters? That is something that is very difficult to find statistics on. It is very difficult to determine the extent to which collective bargaining has taken those benefits and gone beyond and

topped them up beyond the minimum levels provided by the legislation. What we do know, for example, is that in collective agreements covering 500 or more employees (and there is a big difference between large and small employers), in 1980 61% of the collective agreements studied had some provision for maternity leave (Labour Canada). That had increased by January 1988 to 72.7% of collective agreements. That sounds like a large increase but what we do not know is if that is paid leave, how extensive the protection is, how long is the leave, and is there any possibility for extension of the leave, beyond the Employment Standards Act.

For example, a lot of collective agreements will simply say maternity leave is granted as per the Employment Standards Act. As the employer has to comply with the E.S.A. anyway, this is not really a significant benefit. In terms of adoption leave, similar statistics show that in 1980 19.5% of collective agreements had provision for adoption leave. That had risen by January 1988 to 44% of collective agreements. If you talk about marriage leave provisions, the figures show that in 1980, 14.3% of collective agreements had provision for such leave and by January 1988 that had risen to 20.9%. The recognition of the value of these forms of leave, at least in a collective bargaining context, has clearly increased.

I can refer you to some of the provisions in the Post Office agreement on maternity leave. In the Letter Carrier's collective agreement there is a top-up provision in the agreement that will cover an employee absent on maternity leave up to 93% of the wages (a form of supplementary UIC fund). This is a generous provision that continues for a period of 15 weeks. It can further be extended up to 24 weeks but without pay. You do not find that in most agreements; it is unusual and generous.

Paula Rusak

In my experience parenting leave has never been asked for at the table. Even when I have dealt with female dominated unions like the Ontario Nurses' Association parenting leave has never been an issue. The Metropolitan Separate Schools, a female dominated bargaining unit, has a very unusual provision in parenting leave. The one in this agreement allows for up to one full year that an individual can take parenting leave. But there is a qualifier, it isonly given to teachers who are not experiencing significant difficulty in performance.

Larry Steinberg

In the Post Office, the employee going onto the paid maternity leave has to sign a document saying "I'm going to return and if I don't return, I'll pay you back and when I do return, I have to stay for a certain period of time afterwards". This is also a practice in educational leave type provisions.

One further issue to be raised is the provision of child care facilities by employers. There has been a recent negotiation in which the C.A.W. and the automobile manufacturers have established a child care fund that will, in certain instances and where warranted, through a deduction, establish child care spaces and services to employees.

In 1980, child care facilities or benefits were provided in 0.8% of collective agreements. In January of 1988, it had increased to 2 1/2% of collective agreements.

Paula Rusak is a partner in the law firm of Mathews Dinsdale & Clark, Toronto

Larry Steinberg is a partner in the law firm of Koskie & Minsky, Toronto.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS TO PLENARY SESSION

Richard Bradley

Before I introduce our speaker for this plenary session, which is on creating work and family programs in the workplace, I would like to say how very pleased I am that the Child Care Branch has been able to contribute to this event. I have to say that three years ago when I first joined the Ministry, we would not have become involved because the time was probably not quite right. However, with my new responsibilities in the area of employer-supported child care, I can remember firing off internal memos suggesting that we position our own initiatives in this area within the broader context of work and family. The response then was that it was a good idea which should be brought forward in a year or so. Well, here we are!

In June of last year, we came out with our strategic plan, *New Directions For Child Care*, which placed a very special emphasis on the notion of partnerships and the need for collaboration among key players as we begin to build a more comprehensive and integrated child care system in the Province. The conference theme of partnerships clearly supports the principles that are embedded in the New Directions document. In addition, New Directions committed us to host a conference on employer-supported child care this fiscal year. Our ability to follow through on this was somewhat hampered by something that we refer to in government as an "in-year constraint" and some of you will be familiar with that process. Instead, Ryerson has been very gracious in letting us piggyback on this conference, thereby obviating the need to "re-invent another wheel" as it were. We were pleased to be able to participate in the planning process.

Those of you who were not here yesterday can read something about the conference in the Business Section of the Globe and Mail this morning. This is an interesting write-up of some of the key parts of yesterday's session. Perhaps a brief recap would be helpful. In the morning session we looked at the contextual factors within which work and family issues have emerged: the business pressures, the demographics, the social and economic forces which have brought these issues under public scrutiny. We also had an opportunity to examine comparative information and approaches from other countries, most notably the United States and Europe. These sessions were informative and raised some very interesting questions on the future direction of social and economic policy in Canada. From the evidence that was assembled for us, I think most of us emerged from yesterday's sessions feeling that this issue of balancing two independent sets of responsibilities will be a part of family life and of organizational life for some considerable time.

In the afternoon our focus narrowed to some of the more practical issues concerning flexible work arrangements, employee assistance plans, flexible leave provisions and the critically important labour managment arena.

Today, in this plenary session and in the workshops that follow this morning, we will continue this examination of the "how-to" in identifying and responding to work and family issues.

I had a number of impressions from yesterday's sessions, particularly around some of the marvellous images that were expressed. I think, for me, one of the key ones was that image of the daily, or weekly planner on the refrigerator. We have four children at home, ages 7 to 14, and I really identified with that particular image. It graphically symbolizes the scheduling problem.

Two other very clear impressions emerged from yesterday's session for me. First, we still have an enormous task ahead of us in terms of building concensus in this province, and elsewhere in Canada, on an appropriate policy agenda to address the work and family dynamic. Unlike some other western countries, we have a long way to go in terms of defining and integrating policies on such related matters as taxation, social welfare, housing, child care and employment, to name just a few.

The second key impression is that we may have tended to overlook a very important third component in this discussion on work and family, and that is "the community". Organizations, like families and individuals, live and function in the context of "community", however defined. And it is in the community, it seems to me, that many of the resources for work and family solutions have been found in the past and will continue to be found in the months and years ahead.

Richard Bradley is employed by the Child Care Branch, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Government of Ontario

CREATING WORK & FAMILY PROGRAMS IN YOUR WORKPLACE

Julie White

The other day I posted a cartoon in the coffee room at my company that had two people leaving a moving theatre. Both of them were terrified and wide-eyed. The movie was "Conan the Bureaucrat". A lot of people laughed at it and it made me realize that all of us secretly believe in a legion of terrorists for the status quo out there standing in the way of what we really think should be happening. Of course, we are the ones who are out there doing the work so the fear that we have about organizations is not valid. I think we need to take a look at how things happen in organizations and develop a strategy for dealing with them so I am going to start with a couple of myths about corporations, but it could be about any large organization.

The first myth is that organizations are rational in nature. This is simply not true. Do not be fooled by memos that clearly articulate what someone wants to do. In actual fact organizations are led by the same kinds of things that lead us all: biases, attitudes, fears and hormonal imbalances. Do not laugh — a sudden rush of testosterone can be very chaotic in the board room. This is the paradox that we have to keep in mind.

It is particularly important when we are dealing with work and family issues because they really do cut at the heart of our value system. Anyone who has had any experience implementing pay equity can tell you that its not the rational decisions that get made on evaluating jobs, it really is the underlying value system. I am currently on a committee in my own company consisting of 8 individuals that cut across the whole organization (male, female, factory, office, etc.). We thought we would be spending a couple of weeks going over the jobs and using a very rational system to evaluate and compare jobs and now, weeks and weeks later, we are still grapling with the same issues. You can not just deal with the rational thing you have to address the underlying biases and you need to keep that in mind. It is particularly difficult in a corporation where the value of rationality is so highly touted. You have to deal with it on that level but understand it on the other.

Myth two is that 'activity follows strategy'. We have all been through the planning process where you start with your mission, you move to your goals, then objectives and then you develop a very well conceived assortment of programs to meet your mission. However, we all know this is not how it works. We develop our mission and our goals to match what it is we want to do, or in some cases, what we are already doing. That does not mean it is not a good process to go through, it does gives us a conceptual framework to work within and it gives us a way of explaining and justifying what it is that we are doing. It also makes sure there is some consistency in the kinds of activities we are doing in our organizations.

The reason this is important for you to know in this particular context is that it would be a mistake to think that to get work and family programs in your organization that you had to start at the conceptual or goal base. It is not important whether or not your organization understands the impact of issues on work and family at this point.

I talked to a number of organizations when I was putting together this talk and I was unable to find one corporation which started their work in family programs from a conceptual framework of work and family issues. They all started from the program perspective. When I talked to Manulife they talked about starting flex time in response to the TTC. Job sharing and part-time work with benefits flowed out of that and the conceptual theme came later in response to having an assortment of different programs and suddenly realizing that there is something that ties it all together.

Last year I was on the committee that the Canadian Mental Health Association put together to recognize companies who had been very supportive of mental health in the workplace and it was very impressive to see how many very innovative programs are going on out there. It was also very impressive to see the wide range of things that corporations identified as supports to mental health. I do not think that the President of Control Data sat down and said, "Well now, let's see, what can we do about mental health in our workplace? Lets start off with bicycle lockers for our employees and let's make sure that they have free rides home from parties so they don't have to worry about drunk driving, and how

about employee assistance and flex time". The conceptual understanding came later and that is okay.

If you have ever worked in a government department you know what happens if you start too soon with a concept. It goes to a concept paper, discussion paper, consultation package and then maybe it goes to the point where you are actually able to implement some programs if the key people have not already left the organization or been burned out by then. It also assumes that your measurements of how to achieve that program are the same.

You have to know exactly what it is you want to accomplish. How do you do that? How you do that will really depend on the character of your organization and the values of the people in power. There are a couple of ways to analyse your corporate character and I will talk about that in a kind of theoretical way to start. On one end of the continuum is the institution-oriented organizations.

These organizations see themselves as social entities and see that they have an inter-relationship with the kinds of things that are going on in society. They believe there is legitimacy to social claims on their enterprise. They also believe that they can be a part of change in society in general and not just change in their own organizations. In other words, things they do can have an impact on society. They tend to be concerned with long-range consequences. One of the things about corporations like this is that their corporate philanthropy tends to be very issue oriented and related to social concerns rather than internal concerns.

At the other end of the continuum is the enterprise-oriented corporation. It sees itself as a an autonomous economic entity. These are people who believe that the best thing they can do for society is make a profit and provide jobs. This is the "What's good for General Motors is good for America" school of thought. It believes that short-term victories are the best way to deal with long-term stability. Again, the kind of philanthropic programs that this kind of corporation would have would be more linked to their own bottom line, sponsorships and issues that directly relate to the product that they put out.

Your strategy will reflect where your organization is on this continuum. Most of the organizations that I talked to tended toward the institutional model, but that does not mean that you cannot have significant influence on organizations that tend to be more profit-oriented. It means that your strategy will be slightly different in terms of the case that you make.

In my case, my corporation is institutional almost in the extreme. Consequently, our initial day care strategy was very external focussed. We worked a lot with advocacy groups, we made public presentations to government bodies, we supported community based day care and we took a very visible but community focussed role in that.

Others said that the kind of key points that they used with their organizations related to the recruitment and retention of key staff. Having that kind of supportive environment helped them to keep quality people.

If your organization is people oriented then you want to make a case in that regard. What you want to do is to use your own company's or organization's hot spot. Look for what is really important. The people oriented organization will tend to want to have things that come up from employees rather than come through Personnel Departments although there will be some partnership there.

In my company, we have a number of ways in which employees get an opportunity to express their opinions on things. We have quarterly state-of-the-business meetings where various department heads stand up and talk about what it is that is going on in their department and solicit some interest and advice about where the company should be headed. We have breakfast with the President. Everyone in the company at some point in the year gets to sit down with the President in a small group and talk. This month the whole company is going away for two days to talk about corporate values and I would expect that during that time there will be a lot of discussion around these issues and I am encouraging people to raise them.

So, encourage your people to talk about these issues if that is a value to your company. Do not start from the organizational point of view, but let people talk about what it is that they need and want in their own organization. Keep data from exit interviews. This can be extremely helpful and this can be helpful also with the other type of organization that is more bottom-line oriented. You can get a lot of information from exit interviews.

Do climate surveys. If committees are the norm in your organization

you might want to develop a committee to look at a variety of programs. If your corporation likes to be seen as a progressive corporation then you can show them how they can be on the cutting edge of these issues. Here you have an opportunity to sell the concept and not to just deal with the program level. Get visibly involved. There are lots of community organizations out there to partner with and corporations that are institutional oriented tend to like collaborations and problem-solving models.

The visibility also has another positive side effect. It was a tenet in the 60's that there was 3 ways to organizational change or community change. One was negotiation, one was confrontation and the other one was celebration. If your organization is being publically celebrated for its progressive policies on this issue you can be quite sure that they will work very hard to continue to be seen as progressive and to live up to that vision or catch up to that vision of them.

If your organization is at the other end of the spectrum and tends to be more bottom-line oriented then you will want to focus on productivity issues. Again, you can make a very good case here. In my organization the real bottom line people are the plant managers. They are between a rock and a hard place; they are responsible for getting the production out and they tend to be very production oriented and not too in touch with the question of day care in particular. A few years ago, just in conversation, I asked them what they thought the relationship was between child care needs and the turnover rate. We have a very high turnover rate, or absenteeism. They thought that was an interesting question and started to ask it on the exit interviews. It turned out that almost 40% of our turnover was related to child care issues.

Last year I was at an operations meeting where one of the plant managers stood up and gave an absolutely eloquent plea for consideration on this issue and talked about the plight of his people. He was able to translate productivity issues to personal ones, but really it was productivity that caught his attention.

It is not just absenteeism and turnover it is also morale, accidents, etc. Someone sitting at a machine worrying about their child is bound to have an impact on the accident rate. Keep in mind as well that your executive will need to have a cogent argument for the people that he/she reports to or whether it is the board or the people above him/her. If there is a change in management you want to make sure that the new person coming in is briefed on this.

Unfortunately, I learned that the hard way. I have been working in this area within my company for years and made a lot of assumptions of people's understanding of what I was doing. About two years ago we got a new very people-oriented president and it was the longest time before I started to recognize that he really was not supportive to what I was doing on the whole child care issue. I was very perplexed by this because he had been so supportive on other issues. Finally, last month, I sat down with him and said, "Look, let's talk about what is going on here" and I went through the whole rationale of what our involvement had been to date and where I thought we were on this issue and where I thought we should be heading.

It evolved that he was not at all opposed to the kinds of things we were involved with. It came down to two other things. One, he did not know how to answer the question about why we are so involved publically on this issue and why we do not have a workplace day care and it embarrassed him to be in public and not be able to answer that question. Two, because our corporate policy is not to take public positions on political issues in host countries, he could not understand why we were being political about day care when we would not dream of being political on free trade. Once he was able to understand how we differentiate between something that is a service that impacts on our employees and that we have some information that we can provide to public policy makers, which is different than trying to influence the economy or strategic direction of a nation, he felt entirely different.

I realized then that I had not done my work in keeping him informed and helping him to sell these issues and understand these issues and to support them, because management support is obviously going to be extremely important in implementing any of these programs.

So, you get the programs you want, flex time, parental leave, maybe you have a placement program for day care, but it is not over yet. These programs still have to be implemented. Informal resistance can be just as deadly as formal. You need to take a look at what your whole system is to make sure that people are not going to be penalized if they actually take advantage of these or

that your supervisory level is not going to be penalized. There is no point in implementing a program that will have some shakedown problems and then have the person who is responsible for the person taking the leave end up looking bad at the end of the year because productivity is down or it has created some other kind of problem in the organization.

It is also very helpful to have some senior role models using some of the programs. In my company the Director of Human Resources took an extended maternity leave and then came back working part-time for over a year, closer to two years. Although we had a policy for being able to work part-time with benefits, it was not the kind of thing that most executives thought they could do. She gave credibility and legitimacy to doing that. Part-time for executives is a difficult thing to implement. People are often discriminated against in some ways for doing it. They seem to be less organizationally motivated if they do that. However, it is seen as senior management's support for these programs.

Make sure that the information about the programs is widespread. Use your existing communications systems such as bulletin boards, orientation packages, videos for new employees, and newsletters. Write articles on people using the programs and show some success stories. Keep data and feedback, both positive and negative, because some of the programs do have some problems and you need to be aware of them because if a problem becomes too acute and it does not get addressed then what happens is that it just gets ended or not used. Keep alert to what is actually going on with things like flex time and job sharing as they are not all that easy to implement at first.

Keep people informed on educational issues as well. This is where you can start to move into the conceptual framework. Articles and clippings from newspapers and anything else that you come across, post them and provide them to not just decision makers but people in the company. People will start to develop their conceptual basis.

Finally, to sum up, be focussed on your outcomes, know in your own mind exactly what it is you want to do. If its flex time, if its a workplace day care you want then develop your strategy according to that. I had the privilige of working with a woman named Florette Pomeroy who was a force in her community for 50 years. She kept a little turtle on her desk with a bobbing head to remind her of the difference between action and motion.

Make your case broad-based and combine both business and social reasons consistent with your organization's value system. Again, if bottom line is really what is important then those are your key arguments and bring in the other ones. If the other is the norm, focus on that. When I was setting up English classes in our company at the instigation of the President, the same one who started 2 years ago, he thought it was just terrible that many of the employess did not speak English and how terrible it must be to have to come to work and not be able to speak to their supervisor or be able to communicate with the person at the machine next to them. He said, "I want to have English classes on our time in the plant and I want to do it now". So, I developed a program and came back to him and said, "Guess what, the government will pay for it". He did not want to hear about government funding he wanted to hear about the quality of the program. Then I realized I had been making some assumptions about his value system there.

Use the value system that you have and make your case. Make it pallatable and sound rationale. Work on that playing field because that is one of the values of most organizations. Recognize as well the emotional mine fields. A lot of people have noticed that using the term 'dependent care' is a lot more pallatable than 'day care'. More people readily identify with the problems they are facing with their own parents than with the concept of child rearing.

A lot of corporations are concerned about being too paternalistic. There is something that is a little paternalistic about directly dealing with their employee's child care needs. Think about that when you are developing your arguments or your approach. The conceptual support will come. These issues are very incremental in nature and they rely a lot on iteration. People need to hear things over and over and in a variety of ways.

We are doing a lot of Aids training in our company right now and our theory is that people need to hear information five times before it is incorporated into their own understanding. While you are setting up these programs you can be working to tie them together into a conceptual framework and eventually that will happen. When that happens that becomes not just an understanding of the programs that you have but it becomes an attitude in terms of the whole way an organization looks at the way it operates and looks at the relationship that it has to its employees.

Organizations as well are affected by attitudes and things that are happening in society in general. Hopefully, we are moving in a direction where we as a society value our children, families and recognize that they are a social responsibility and a social treasure and not just an individual one.

Julie White is National Manager of Public Affairs, Levi Strauss, Inc.

EMPLOYER-SUPPORTED CHILD CARE: GROUP BASED CARE

Case studies examining differing types of workplace child care centres.

SUNNYBROOK CRECHE SUNNYBROOK MEDICAL CENTRE

Bice Awan and Catherine Priske

We started planning the whole program of workplace daycare at Sunnybrook Medical Centre in 1979 and the centre did not open until 1983. That shows that if any of you are thinking of getting into workplace day care that it is not a simple process.

It was not a groundswell of opinion that got the centre going, and it was not corporate strategy. There were a couple of us who felt that there was something going on in our community at Sunnybrook that needed to be addressed. I was in Human Resources at the time, and had run a day care centre in the garment industry in Britain, and it seems so simple looking back at it now. In 1979 we were having significant turnover in our nursing staff. We felt it was a woman's issue at that time because it was a nursing-orientated problem that we were dealing with, so we felt day care would be appropriate for recruitment and retention. I got together with a couple of other nursing managers and an executive who were interested in looking into the issue.

In the middle of November we started thinking about the day care issue, trying to consolidate what was happening and where we should go, not in any formal strategic way at all, no plan, no concept of what we would do but just knew we had to do something to try and alleviate the problem and we also had a sense of social responsibility.

In November 1979 I presented a brief to an executive at Sunnybrook who was in charge of the financial element because I thought that was the most appropriate way to go. If we wanted money we had better start with the person in charge of the dollars. That Director listened and said that, "We were told that being in a publically funded organization, it would not be easy to get funds from the government to fund something for our own benefit".

However, we were not daunted by that. We started the whole process of looking at alternatives. I think it is very important for anyone setting up a day care facility, or even looking at day care in any context, to look at a variety of alternatives. We looked at contracting out, setting up in a school and setting up in the community. We kept exploring a variety of alternatives and even then we were not sure of what we wanted.

I want to make sure you understand we were not working with a strategic plan, we were working on our gut feelings. It started to consolidate during 1980 and at the end of 1980 I presented a further brief to the same executive with some others who were involved at that time, basically saying we want to go ahead. We knew either we go with this or we give up because we were commiting a lot of our time and we had other corporate responsibilities.

In November 1980 we got a verbal "go ahead, do what you feel you have to do, but don't ask us for anything because we can't give it to you". Sunnybrook executives gave us the time to get on with the planning and their verbal blessing. There was no contract or commitment from them so there was no formal partnership from Sunnybrook's perspective. At that point in time we were quite upset over their saying "You have our blessing, but do it on your own".

Looking back, however, we had phenomenal support. If you can market something in a way which looks like it will have spinoff for the organization, even from a profile perspective, you will get the commitment, even if it is a moral commitment. Although we received no money and had to start looking at our organization being set up as a separate corporation, the commitment was there in terms of our partnership with Sunnybrook. For example, we did not have to pay for any planning; we did not have to pay for any legal resources as we started the process, and we did not have to pay for any financial administration supports. Additionally, we got advice on how to get money and the whole partnership was very helpful and supportive.

We had a number of processes going on at the same time in 1981. We had the planning process in place because we felt we had a goal and we had to explore it and we had to explore it very quickly but we also had the financial process being put into place, i.e. trying to find the money, and we were also undertaking a needs analysis. It did not happen in a systematic way. We started a

needs analysis 18 months further on in the process and thank goodness we found there was a need.

We did a needs analysis of not only the workplace setting at Sunnybrook Medical Centre but in the community as a whole because we were interested in our total community not just the isolated Sunnybrook community as a workplace and we found that we had a commitment of 31 full-time registrants and 36 part-time registrants.

We also had a commitment of land at Sunnybrook where we could establish our facility and we chose to go with a modular system type. It looks like a big box from the outside and its fantastic in the inside because we entered into another partnership with Ryerson.

We, to be quite frank, did not know what we were doing but we knew where the expertise lay and we linked up with Ryerson who helped us plan the internal facility. We, therefore, had a whole process of extreme action in place during the course of one year and a half, building, planning and eventually programming, all of which is very, very time consuming. For any of you who think that you can do it easily and quickly, you cannot. It is very time consuming, very draining, very exciting but also it is very worrying.

We started with a very minimal budget, about $250,000, yet the centre when completed required about $450,000 and we had to raise this. So, again, if any of you are not "into" fund raising and you want to start a workplace day care centre you will be forced into fund raising in a big way. We accessed the funds, we got the doors up but not open in July 1982. Then we advertised for a Director because we knew that we needed someone on site who knew exactly what they were doing to pull it together. As a result, the doors opened in 1983.

We hired a Director in August of 1982 and we opened in February of 1983. She had to consolidate all our visions and our visions encompassed 24-hour care, crisis care, sick child care, drop-in care and full-day care for children from our community. We felt the doors will open, all spaces will be filled and we will be self-sufficient. It does not happen that way.

In terms of reality we have a maximum of 66 children. What we thought of as our dream and our planning of 75 is not a reality. Now we have that financial situation to deal with.

The Sunnybrook Creche Board represented many departments at the workplace and provided a variety of expertise to the child program.

Initially, there was a list of 130 parents who were desperate for child care. We were building the facility, we did not renovate, so it took longer. It was during the winter so you can imagine the disruptions and the delays. There were three opening dates and many difficulties. At one point we had a sod turning ceremony which gave us a chance to communicate with all the employees who were waiting and it gave them some ideal of what was happening, what our need was and how they could volunteer to help us.

The contributions from the workplace and the relationship that developed between the Centre and the Sunnybrook employees became one of the really valuable support systems. They were proud of us whether or not they had children in our Centre. Many people volunteered and we opened on February 28, 1983.

Learn about the Day Nurseries Act because it is the 'Bible' for what you will have to do to set up your centre and your programs. You have to do a lot of co-ordinating with various building, health, fire inspectors, etc. to get your license to open your program and all of this takes time and expertise. Find your ECE Supervisor/Director early and get them on line to help you with this process.

We started with only with 12 children. This is a phenomenon that other centres have experienced when they first open. The original wait list slips and the centre opens with very few children. Many of the parents who were originally contacted had been lost because of the 3 to 4 year planning period. Parents are not likely to move a child who is settled in one day care arrangement to a new one without seeing what the centre is going to be like. A hospital in London opened with one child on their first day! It does grow and Sunnybrook is almost at full capacity. They are now in the process of reviewing what they have done and are looking towards what they might do in the future.

Bice Awan is a Director of Sunnybrook Creche, Sunnybrook Medical Centre, Toronto. Catherine Priske is a private consultant on Preschool Services in Toronto. She was previously Director of Sunnybrook Creche.

NEWPARK DAY CARE, MAGNA INTERNATIONAL

Wendy Campbell

Most of our divisions are really spread around all over North America and in Europe, but the biggest concentration is in Southern Ontario and what Magna is moving towards is setting up industrial campii. The first one is in Newmarket and that is where our day care is. The campus concept is to have day care, recreation and hopefully health facilities within those campii.

In 1984 Magna did a study on day care through Corporate Employee Relations and there were a lot of alternatives presented at that time. What happened was that through upper management within Magna it was determined that on-site day care would be the best option for Magna at that point in time. Another survey was done of employees to see what people wanted and another survey was done again in 1985 in Newmarket at our campus after it had opened to get an idea of what empoyees wanted. At that time there was a 50% response to the survey and about 92% wanted on-site day care. So this upheld what the company thought was important at that point in time.

Parents did expect lower than competitive fees to be available at the day care, if not 'free'. At that time there was interest for approximately 100 children in the day care. The building was started in 1985 and fortunately someone from within Human Resources had the foresight to say we need to hire a consultant. Through Cradleship Creche we had an excellent consultant and she was involved in helping with the building, facility planning, original operating budget and in hiring the Director.

In March 1986 I was hired and I was responsible for setting up a budget for the day care, deciding what equipment we needed within the day care, hiring staff, meeting with our Advisory Board who were the preliminary Board of Directors. There were representatives from each of the plants on our campus involved in that Advisory Board and they played a very important role in starting Newpark. They were able to help determine what the policies, the hours, and the fees were going to be in co-operation with the corporation.

I cannot stress enough the importance of their input because they would go back to their plants, show them the plans of the building, collect questions from people to come back with, regarding policies etc., to the Advisory Board.

We opened on July 1, 1986. The start-up costs, and please do not be discouraged by this, were 1.2 million dollars. We have a beautiful facility with a lot of land. We got $55,000 from the government for initiative start and planning but it is nice to know that now there is more money available for that.

We opened with a capacity for 98 children from six weeks to five years of age, and at that time we had 20 infants, 30 toddlers and 48 preschoolers for which we were licensed. We actually opened with 13 children which was wonderful. We already had children enrolled for over the next period of months.

The Board of Directors was then in place. We have a 12 member board, 2 are Magna representatives and 10 are parents from our day care. Again, their role is essential and it is viewed that way within Magna. The input of the employees is so important to running a good day care. When employees are happy with the service they are your ambassadors within the company to other employees.

Our fees at that time were $50 per child per week for any age child. Fees were deducted through payroll deduction which was an employee request. Our enrollment by December 1986 was 56 children. Our hours were 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. That changed in January 1988, to 6:15 a.m. to 6:15 p.m. That was because there was a need for people working on the line early in the morning not to have to rush off when they dropped off babies and to be able to talk to the staff.

Our fee structure also changed at that time to $105 per week per child. We only have actually six parents who pay that. It is based on income so parents come to see me and we have a scale to work with and its based on the combined income of parents. The average parent pays $74 per week and some pay as little as $25 or $55 so we can look at individuals and what their needs are. Magna presently, under our budget, is picking up about 40% of the costs of the day care.

We also changed our licensed capacity to 101 and changed the mix of children. We are now licensed for 10 infants, 28 toddlers and 63 preschoolers. It is not because there is not a need for infants, we do have a large waiting

list, but it is because the cost of infant care is so high and it is so difficult to find good staff to work in a group setting for infants. We are looking at the possibility of getting into private home day care and setting up a second day care in the Vaughan area where we also have started a new campus and there is a very big need there.

We have 22.5 staff, 18 teachers (2 of which job share in our infant program) and we have 4.5 support staff. One is a receptionist who is blind and the assistant director and myself as well as a cook, housekeeper and a bookkeeper.

Our fee structure again is under review by the Board. They are doing a survey of the parents as well as holding a parent meeting to involve them in the decision making in that aspect.

An important point I would like to make is that there are a few essential ingredients in setting up a good day care whether in the workplace or community based. The first one is your staff. It is so important, not just to have trained staff but to pay your staff properly and provide good benefits, because the turnover is the biggest concern in day care and will ultimately affect your program and how happy your employees are with the program. The second point is the equipment you have for the staff to work with; and thirdly, a good facility. They are all important ingredients.

I think the biggest thing we have learned is how important public relations is within the company and dealing with Human Resources people, to help them understand concerns and issues around day care. Our biggest problem has been sick children and trying to help supervisors and general managers understand that this is an ongoing problem and it will happen. We want to help in supporting our parents in dealing with their supervisors.

Wendy Campbell is the Director of the Newpark Day Care

THE FASHION DISTRICT DAY CARE CENTRE

Jane Beach

I want to talk about the Fashion District Day Care which started quite differently from the other two programs. But, regardless of how programs get started, I think in the planning stage some really key ingredients are:

1. A commitment from the decision makers, those who have the power to say yes or no, is probably the first thing you need.

2. Money

3. Space

4. Time and resources.

No matter how much planning you do at the beginning it will always take more of each of those things than you possibly imagined. Therefore, the largest ingredient is a sense of humour to keep going under often very stressful times.

The Fashion District Day Care is a group facility for 52 children, infants to 5 years, whose parents work in the garment industry. Its located in a city owned building right in the heart of the district on Richmond Street, Toronto. The program is run by George Brown College as one of their lab schools.

All families who use it have to have at least one parent who works in the garment industry and all parents receive some sort of subsidy either government subsidy or an internal subsidy. It was several years in planning, about 4 1/2 years from first contact until the doors opened. It involved a number of City departments, primarily Planning, Property and City Budget Committee, the Industry, the Union, and a variety of other organizations including the Immigrant Women's Centre.

It is just now celebrating its first anniversaray. It opened in November 1987. The first contact came in the Spring of 1983 after the result of the city establishing a task force on workplace day care.

The Taskforce on Workplace Day Care which later became the Work Related Day Care Task Force started in 1982 to try to encourage employers to assist some kind of workplace day care program in the city. As part of that outreach an initial mailing was done to several thousand organizations in the city. One of the union stewards from the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union responded. It

presented many obstacles and challenges. Space was one, cost was another, language barriers was a major problem for us since very few of the workers spoke English. Ongoing support was needed. Many employers, about 300, were interested in being involved in some way and they all had a different way of operating and doing business. About half the programs are unionized and there is quite a split between unionized and non-unionized companies. To try and reach both in a satisfactory manner was another challenge.

While there was quite a lot of interest initially, things did not move very quickly for a couple of years. A building was identified which is where the program ended up, but there was some initial resistence from the industry. The head of the industry wanted to be able to look out his window and see the day care so he had his eye on another building which happened to house two alternative schools so that was a bit of a struggle initially.

In the fall of 1985, it was not until then that things really started moving. The city established the Fashion Industry Liaison Committee to try to support the industry which was sagging somewhat. The committee was made up of city representatives, and members of the unions, the various employers, community colleges, Immigrant Womens' Centre and other people who were interested in the industry. Surprisingly, they identified the need for day care as one of the top priorities for the industry. Also, obviously, a committee of City Council has political clout.

The first thing was to secure space. We ended up going back to the city owned building on Richmond Street, which we had renovated. It ended up costing about $450,000.

A difficult task, in the City of Toronto, is finding outdoor play space so at huge expense, we had to build a rooftop playground. That is not a cheap proposition especially when you have to cut through the roof of the building and that accounted for over $100,000. This building was slated to be renovated anyway as I mentioned, and if it had gone through the normal channels of going through the City Property Department and having the city contract it out, the cost of renovating it for office space would in fact have been more than double what we paid to renovate for day care.

The next step was to do a needs assessment. That presented another interesting challenge given the language barrier. We developed a questionnaire and had it translated into five languages. Interviews were carried out during many a lunch hour beside sewing machine operators on their half-hour lunch with the assistance of some translators. One lesson I learned from doing this was the difficulties in translation. We did not realize that there was quite a literacy problem, until questionnaires were returned in native tongue with every box checked. This did not prove to be very useful. We realized that we really needed to do these in person and also in starting up this program a literacy program for parents and other people in the garment industry would be really helpful so that started going at the same time.

The next task was to select an operator. The city has long had the policy of day cares having to be non-profit. It could be operated by a separate corporation or an independent organization. In this case we decided to go with George Brown College since they had close ties with the industry. They teach power sewing machine courses and design courses. They also have a history of offering quality child care in the city. We brought them on fairly early on.

Once all the players were in place, obviously, we had to come up with the money. The City provided us with a budget of 1/2 million dollars to work with. The City Property Department initially said it would be at least 1.2 million, but we were able to go outside and not go through our internal channels and advertise for an architect and go through a tendering process for contractors and that actually reduced the costs significantly. It was really a treat to be able to work with an architect from the beginning and even though it was not being built from scratch, a 1930's building has its drawbacks. If it is at all possible to have the capital investment in the beginning, it pays off over and over again in a well-funtioning program.

Apart from the actual start-up costs there was ongoing operating costs. The city decided to contribute the rent. They forgave the rent and paid the utilities, cleaning and maintenance. The industry itself had a fund which donated $50,000 toward start-up costs and there was also a $55,000 start-up grant from the Ministry of Community & Social Services. That all went for toys and equipment and staff salaries before the program actually opened.

One of the big problems was that everybody using this program needed subsidy; Metro was

extremely co-operative. A lot of these people were refugees and new immigrants and did not feel comfortable going to an in-take office for subsidy interviews. The interviews were conducted at another George Brown Day Care centre; day care was provided for the parent and translators were brought in. People were made to feel as comfortable as possible. It really pointed out the flaws in our 'needs tests' system since many of these parents had very low incomes and did not qualify for subsidy because they had lived in substandard housing, had scrimped and saved and managed to put a few dollars aside, and those assets were counted against them. No matter how little they earned, they spent less, and this is not our North American ethic. We think that however much you earn you always spend more. It was sad to feel that these parents were going to be penalized. So the industry did establish a fund for parents who could not qualify for subsidy and they would be able to access this and parents using that fund paid around $35 per week.

George Brown staff were just terrific in attending multicultural workshops and trying to become more sensitive to the needs of the children they were going to be serving, which probably had a much higher composition of children whose first language was not English. It turns out that the vast majority of them are Chinese speaking. It was really difficult to find ECE trained Chinese speaking staff but they were able to find two which was a big help. Trying to find multicultural toys, pictures and oriental dolls is very difficult, but the staff really persevered to make the parents feel that a real effort was being made to recognize the diversity that was going to be in the program.

There were a number of difficulties in getting the centre opened, such as working with a very old building, asbestos and globs of glue that hold these things in the ceiling that are toxic which had to be scraped off by hand. It always takes longer. If you have an opening date, put it ahead in your mind by a month and if you are lucky you will open that day.

Jane Beach is employed by the Child Care Branch of the Ministry of Community and Social Services, Province of Ontario.

EMPLOYER-SUPPORTED CHILDCARE: RESOURCE AND REFERRAL SERVICES

Case studies of "other than centre care" models of support for working parents.

THE MANUFACTURERS LIFE INSURANCE CO.

Cherie Wright

I would like to talk about Microchip and I am going to lead up to that by giving a little background on how we have progressed in looking at the issues and providing support to our employees not only around day care but around the whole issue of dependent care, starting back in the 70's with the issue of day care.

Before I do that I would like to dispell a couple of myths that have built up around the level of support that the Manufacturers provides to employees around the day care issue and that is that we do not have on-site day care, nor do we subsidize day care programs. However, we have been, for many years, recognized as a fairly progressive company in terms of human resources practices.

In the early 1970's, there were a great number of women returning to the workforce following their pregnancies. Recognizing that, the Manufacturers undertook a comprehensive study that looked at the issue of on-site day care, work related day care, subsidies and the experience of other organizations. Out of that study and a follow-up survey with our staff, it was concluded that the Manufacturers should not go into the business of day care as there were enough quality, affordable day care facilities within the area of our head office which is near Bloor & Yonge, Toronto. Also, our population is drawn from many different areas and a great many people did not wish to bring their children into the downtown core. Rather, the employees felt they would like to keep their children in their own community or wanted to share the responsibility for drop-off and pick-up of their child with their spouse. Based on this feedback, we decided not to go with on-site day care.

The issue was revisited again in 1976 when a task force studying the status of women in the company again identified the issue of day care as being very important and recommended that 15 to 20 child care spaces be obtained with a facility that was already established. We, in fact, had a number of our employees using a facility which was looking to buy a property in the downtown area and to renovate that to provide day care.

We entered into an agreement with the facility, Hilda Roberts, to assist them with their funding for that project, in return for which they did two things: first, they agreed to provide infant space, which was not something that they had previously planned to do but which we felt was a critical factor for our employees, and they also agreed to provide us with ten spaces per year.

The agreement with Hilda Roberts Day Care was in effect from 1979 to 1987 and it proved to be a mutually beneficial arrangement. Our employees generally occupied 12-14 spaces in the facility, about 25% of their capacity. It obviously did not meet all employees' needs but it did offer a level of service, especially for those people with infants. At the end of last year the facility changed hands and with the current owners we do not have any formal agreement for any priority on space as we did previously. In fact, at the end of our agreement with Hilda Roberts we were running into difficulty as they gradually reduced the infant spaces from nine to four spaces, which meant we were faced with a wait of 18 months to 2 years for infant spaces for our employees.

As a result of these problems and the change in ownership at Hilda Roberts, we were looking for an opportunity to provide something for employees that would support their needs. One of the options was to look for satellite facilities around the city, in the north, east and west, and to try to negotiate some space priority in these facilities. That, however, never got off the ground owing to time constraints.

Fortunately, Microchip came along at that time. Microchip is a micro computerized program. It is an on-line system, very user-friendly, available 24 hours per day and it is cost effective. The program itself works with any PC that is IBM compatible and the only other equipment needed is a link to the data base via a modum.

The benefit of the Microchip program is that it offers the employee a great reduction in time spent trying to locate suitable day care arrangements. It also provides them with an opportunity to sit down and look at all the options that are available and to evaluate what is best for them in terms of program type, cost and location. For the company, it reinforces our commitment to support employees' needs and it also reduces the potential for lost time

and lost productivity while employees are taking time out to phone around, etc. to locate child care. This service is free for employees and completely confidential.

Interestingly enough, I find also there is an increasing usage by males who are looking for information. Perhaps their spouse does not work for the Manufacturers but they can still get the information. We also have a number of employees who will come in and ask for information for friends or relatives, so there is really good feedback. From June to November we have had approximately 100 uses.

In addition to the Microchip program being available to us in Toronto it is planning to go coast-to-coast. For us that may offer an opportunity in the future to make the program available to our Branch staff. For any of you who are in Head Office situations with branches across Canada and the United States you know that the perception is Corporate Head Office has all the "goodies" and its unfortunate but you can not always have everything available to the Branches.

An information base for elder care is also being developed by Microchip which we feel is a really important issue, and a growing issue and it is something that we plan to address in 1989 through our Work and Family series.

Our Work & Families Series was introduced in 1984 and we have offered a wide range of programs. We started out with a lunch hour workshop in 1984 to talk about issues people were facing in balancing the demands of their careers and their families. The initial focus was on people who were in dual career family situations. Out of that we developed a work and family task force and a steering committee. From that point we have gone on to provide a wide range of noonhour programs using experts in various fields.

I would like to recommend that for any of you who are looking at Work and Family Initiatives, things can be done that are not too costly. These programs, for instance, address a wide variety of needs. It is a very visible level of support conducted over the lunch hour. We encourage people to bring their lunch to the sessions and we provide refreshments. We have used resources from Dellcrest, and we had Kathy Gallagher Ross who provided the seminar series Childcare Sharing & Caring which was an excellent program. These kinds of things are not very costly. Microchip is another way of providing a visible level of support to employees without a great cost attached to it.

The Manufacturers has policies in place that provide support to our employees around balancing the demands of work and family. For instance, our maternity leave policy offers 17 weeks unpaid leave, continuity of benefits and accumulation of sick days and vacation credits. We also have in place an SUB plan which goes into effect to top up the salary of anybody who currently earns in excess of $29,000 and that is in relation to the maximum that UIC pays. This is available for 15 weeks or for the period that they are paid by UIC. If for any reason they are not paid the full UIC benefit our SUB plan will apply only for the comparable number of weeks paid by UIC.

We also have an adoption leave program that offers up to 17 weeks unpaid leave and may be extended to 6 months unpaid leave. The six-month requirement is quite often necessary when you are adopting a child as some agencies insist that the parent be home six months with the child to allow for bonding to take place.

We also have a paternity leave program that provides full pay for the day of delivery of the baby and the day on which the mother and baby arrive home providing that they are working days.

We have flex-time and opt-time options which, if they are managed well, are usually beneficial for the organization and the employee. This allows employees to make personal arrangements for doctor and dental appointments, etc. on their day off.

Our Canadian Division in Waterloo is currently in the process of negotiating to provide day care space for our Head Office employees there. They are quite excited about an agreement they are trying to reach with Conestoga College which would be funded 1/3 by the Manufacturers and 2/3 by the Ministry of Community and Social Services. If that project is approved, and a decision is expected by March 1989, then Conestoga College would provide land and staffing to cover the day-to-day operations of the project. It would provide about 90 places and 30 of those would be for Manufacturers' employees.

Cherie Wright is Staff Services Co-ordinator, The Manufacturers Life Insurance Co., Toronto

XEROX CANADA INC.

John Mills

At this point, and into the immediate future, employer-supported child care in Xerox Canada means the Working Parents Day Care Assurance Plan which is an information, counselling, consultation and referral service provided to our employees through Family Day Care Services.

Day care in this form, is an employee benefit for Xerox Canada employees; that means that it is provided to any employee who cares to use it at no cost and that it is available an unlimited number of times. Utilization is unlimited. Our experience with this service to date has been very positive according to reports we receive from employees and our utilization rate, surprisingly perhaps, is running around 6-7%. Naturally, one has to be very careful with that because utilization for one person means one telephone conversation with the counsellor but to another it could well mean several personal meetings both with the employee and his or her spouse.

What I would like to do is to describe to you in a simplified version, the process of discussion, approval and decision that we went through with the company's senior management to bring us to this point.

We said that child care is a significant concern within the community generally and, our research showed us, certainly amongst Xerox Canada employees. We said further that, in our view, there is an important role for Xerox Canada to play in two respects: first, in responding to the reasonable, legitimate concerns and needs of our employees and, second, in terms of making a contribution in some form to broader community needs.

We said that the issues, as we saw them, were that day care should be considered to be a basic support service to working parents; not something that is nice but something that is basic and necessary. We said that indications were, though this is not always clear because there are different views on every topic, that there is a major shortage of licensed day care space. Our focus here is on the quality of what is available as well as the availability of it. We recognized that available day care is not affordable to most parents. Current rates in Toronto are somewhere in the order of $30 per day and, by the end of the month, that is a lot of money for anybody and especially for those who most need this kind of support.

The other point we made was that as far as we could tell most corporate action was taking place in the information, personal consultation and referral services. We said further, to Senior Managers, these are the program options that are available to Xerox Canada and that the type of day care involvement that we might take would be dependent on many factors which would vary from locale to locale. Although our company geography and demographics are not unique, we have people in 63 different places across the country. Some of them are in large numbers like Toronto where we have 2500 employees and others are small like Sault Ste. Marie where we have one sales rep and one service rep. It is our obligation to service them all as best we can.
The type of day care involvement would depend on local conditions; for example, the kind of day care that is already available in a particular community, on government funding which might or might not be available, on employee needs, and on available company resources. That last is a key consideration. Any for-profit organization is always having to make and balance choices. The well is not bottomless.

Our general objective we defined in the following way: to endeavour to put in place a comprehensive system of child care support which, as best we could manage, effectively balanced these goals

1. Meeting employees' needs, requiring reasonable financial commitments by Xerox Canada delivered in a planned and orderly fashion. Nothing upsets accountants worse than surprises.

2. One which requires employees to participate financially. We feel the responsibility in this area, as in many others, is most properly shared and is available to all Xerox Canada employees.

3. Offers a range of options to meet a range of child care needs. One size does not fit all.

4. Achieves positive results for employees. There is no sense spending money if it does not help.

5. Reinforces employee goodwill andXerox Canada's positive public image.

6. Limits corporate liability. That is another side, if you like, of commitments being planned, orderly and predictable. Clearly, we could not afford to go into

something where we face potentially unlimited liability.

We put these program recommendations to the Management Committee.

1. To introduce the Working Parents' Daycare Assurance Plan as a pilot program for head office on the assumption that, if it is successful and achieves positive results, we would extend it to all major Xerox Canada Inc. locations over 5 years.

2. As a follow-on, implement agency home day care and emergency child care in those communities where it is not now available.

3. To be able to make some contribution to the supply of spaces.

4. Identify workplace day care centres as future possible options.

5. Consider taking a position of public advocacy on work-related day care.

We introduced WPDCAP as a pilot program to head office employees in December 1986. The extension is currently in process. We extended it to the rest of Toronto in October 1988 and introduced it to Ottawa in November 1988. We anticipate introducing it to Vancouver next month and I am not sure if this is anticipation or hope, to Halifax, Edmonton and Calgary by mid-1989.

We had hoped that close to the top of the list would be Montreal and Quebec City, because in terms of the number of employees that we employ there, those are two significant centres but we are having a really hard time finding anyone to work with us. A lot of interest and support, but nevertheless, we cannot get anyone to step up to the mark.

The feasibility study of this possibility (i.e. development and implementation of agency home care and emergency day care) is due hopefully before Christmas, but certainly this December.

John Mills is Manager, Employee Relations and Benefits, Xerox Canada Inc., North York, Ontario

CHILD CARE ADVISORY LINE

Karen Liberman

I am pleased to have this opportunty to share my perspectivies both as a consultant to corporations and as someone who is, in effect, a service provider. We have seen some people talk about the decision-making process of actually choosing an information and counselling service, but I would like to share with you an example of an information and counselling service, what it does, how it works, what your expectations of it can be, etc.

This grew out of my consulting practice. I worked with companies and organizations who were identifying the issue of child care as one in which they wanted to be involved but were indeed not sure about, such things as multi-sitedness and were not sure about geographical equity issues related to one head office. More and more I became aware that companies in the United States, for example, were looking for information and counselling services as a way of addressing a wide variety of employee needs and at the same time appeared to be equitable. In addition, where it was being done in the United States it was also serving to generate action in the community, for example, the development of new infant care spaces.

With that in mind, I came back to Canada determined to combine my social service program and my knowledge of the child care scene with the very best that technology had to provide. What we were looking to do, when we developed CALL, was to develop something that was going to be relevant over time for employees and relevant over time in the corporate sector. Consequently, the service is a service designed specifically for corporations, it is not designed to serve a public need.

The company buys into this service on behalf of all their employees. We, in fact Xerox Canada Inc.

John Mills, are already as close to national as we can get without Quebec. We are finding it incredibly difficult to get the information, to get sources of information, and the problems are not only differences in regulations and so on, and coming to understand the Quebec system as well as we would like to in order to provide the kind of quality information we need to, but as

well there is a language problem and we are trying to deal with that as best we can.

With the exception of Quebec we would say we are, in fact, a national service. We are launching our affiliation with a provider of elder care information and counselling services so we are now in the business of providing not only child care information and counselling but also information and counselling on elder care.

For some of your organizations this will be important, particularly in those organizations where the political circumstance within the organization might be seen to be a little resistant to child care. Very often I have had senior executives say to me, when we talk about work and family issues in the broad spectrum, "You know, not everyone in my company has children, but just about everyone in my company was born". So they all have parents. Consequently, we see this as another dimension of providing for some companies a full range of service.

In point of fact, one of the things we hope to do is to make everybody comfortable with this kind of approach. If a company chooses, for example, to start off with elder care, we can deliver that service and then move into child care when the company feels comfortable with that kind of service.

We are not, and never will be, an information and referral service. We are an information and counselling service. We have absolutely no relationship with the listings on our service. We are not funded by the United Way or by the Ministry of Community and Social Services so we have what we believe is a very arms length and consequently we think a very objective approach to information.

What does it do? Well, because it is information and counselling and because we use a highly sophisticated data base and we in fact use micro computers extensively, it is important to understand that the micro computer technology remains with CALL. Our service to employees is an information dispensation and counselling service so we actually have a personal relationship with every employee in the company using the service. In point of fact, every company has its own child care advisor who works with the company from day one to orientation, workshops, helping people to understand how to use the service and how to use it well and calling for information and consultative support. It is the same person who will be calling the employee back to find out if they did find infant care and was the price agreeable to them, etc. It is a very intense personal relationship that is developed over time. That relationship evolves into these areas of support and this is a critical issue we believe.

The search and selection of programs is done using the technology and the parents' own criteria. Based on what the parents tell us is important to them: cost, location, my 1-year old is allergic to cow's milk, I want all the care givers in the day care centre to be fully trained, or I want a nanny from inside the country, all of that information is being fed into the computer and the computer is searching out all the options. We believe that will reduce the time lost to corporations because all of that happens outside of office hours. When an employee calls us we make the appointment to provide this consultative service to them in a very personal and relevant way.

An added dimension, besides the search and selection, is we work with employees to adjust to the new child care arrangements. We provide counselling services on what it means when your baby cries for three days in the new child care arrangement. In addition, we help employees to monitor the quality of child care. If an employee does not call us back we call them to find out how it is going, what to look for, how do you know about a change in your child's behavior, what should you be asking care givers, etc.

Finally, we support parent's understanding the emergency and temporary care service industry. We have a philosophy around CALL and that is 'if your child care arrangements can break down they will'.

Karen Liberman is President of Families That Work, and Director of CALL.

ELDERLY DEPENDENT CARE

A presentation about support programs for employees who are responsible for an elderly dependent.

THE CHILD, YOUTH AND FAMILY POLICY RESEARCH CENTRE

Dick Barnhorst

I would like to briefly discuss several factors that are likely to increase the pressure on family members to provide adequate care for their elderly dependents.

First of all, there is a growing government concern in Ontario and throughout North America, where populations are aging, about the tremendous increase in costs in caring for elderly people. There is a steady increase in Canada in the number of elderly as a percentage of the population.

Also, elderly people are, in fact, living longer. The greatest increase is in the over 75 age group. There is increased mental and physical impairment in this age group, (e.g. Alzheimers Disease).

At the same time, there is an increasing emphasis in Ontario, which has one of the highest rates of institutionalization of the elderly in the world, on keeping elderly people out of institutions like Homes for the Aged and Nursing Homes, i.e., long-term care facilities. The alternative, of course, is to keep them in the community, if possible. This means in their own homes, apartments and group settings, all with support services attached or available. Several surveys have indicated that it is a strong preference of the elderly to stay in their own communities and not institutions.

Another factor that we are seeing is higher levels of care in long-term care institutions. What that means is that if a province like Ontario is trying to encourage more community support services, rather than institutional service, and we are having higher levels of care in the institutions, what we are going to see are heavier levels of care in the community.

Community support programs for the elderly have traditionally relied heavily on volunteers. In Ontario, the programs tend to be an ad hoc arrangement across the province. There are some provincial associations of service providers, and others are emerging, but there has not been a very strong community support service voice in Ontario.

Community support programs rely on volunteers and family members to help keep the elderly persons at home. Typically, these volunteers and family members who provide the care are women and, with more women in the workforce, there will be fewer volunteers and family members available to do this kind of work. In addition, the paid workers in these programs (e.g. homemakers) earn very little and there is an increasing difficulty in retaining them.

These factors lead to a tremendously increasing pressure on employees to obtain services, time, money and basic information about what to do to help their elderly dependents. The fact is, this is an area that has not received sufficient attention and it is going to grow in the future and various forces and trends will put a tremendous burden on family members, men and women.

Dick Barnhorst is Executive Director of the Child, Youth and Family Policy Research Centre, Toronto

FAMILY SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Sally MacEwen

Let me begin with some demographics. Almost one in ten is over 65 in our population today. That is going to rise by the year 2000 to 12%, and by 2030 we will have one in five, 20% of our population. People are living much longer and the over 85 group is becoming greater and greater. This has a great impact on all of us.

With regard to normal aging, biologically, acuity diminishes to some extent after 65 and this means that vision may fail. This can mean falls. Hearing diminishes which can mean a loss of independence and a feeling of isolation. Diabetis and arthritis are very common diseases. There is normally some memory loss. Depression is very prevalent, over 25% close to the age of 65. Chronological aging is probably

the least important; the functional aging is what is important.

Most people over 65 can manage and manage very well. About 20% need some kind of help and about half of these need a great deal such as nursing care or institutional care. The task usually falls upon women to deal with this.

There are a couple of myths about aging. One is the "golden age" myth. "Golden age" is a time in the past, when we looked after our old people much better, they were very wise and passed on cultural traditions; it was largely an agrarian society and the elders were seen as being in the warm embrace of a multi-generational family. There have been studies done and that myth is, in fact, just that -- a myth. Certainly that did exist for some families but they found that most of the ones who were venerated in this way were comprised of a small, elite group of males. This paradise did not exist for poor people, for the most part it was reserved for those who were powerful and who headed up families. People then, as they do now, were living three generations in a family mainly for economic reasons.

The other myth, "Alienation", is supposed to be the one of today where people do not care about their aged any longer. This also is a myth. Two studies, one in the United States and one in Canada, found that there are often very caring and supportive relationships. One study in London, Ontario even looked at different cultures. (There is a common idea that different cultures have different and better ideas about how to treat their aged). It was found in these studies that Canadians are not cold and unsympathetic people.

In the workplace 25% of the employees over 40 are looking after some elder relative, and most of these are women. The other thing, of course, is that because people are living longer, it may not be the child but the grandchild who is saying, "It is my grandparent who needs this and my parents can't look after her because they are in their 70's or are retired and living in the south, so we have to deal with this". This requires a great deal of time to say nothing of the emotional upheaval.

The October issue of People Magazine showed a picture on the cover of an elderly lady crying saying, "How can my family do this?" The article dealt with the family's decision to put her into a nursing home and of the agony and guilt they went through first waiting for a place and then actually carrying it out.

We have something now in our society which we call the "new pioneers". These are the caregivers or kinkeepers. These are women; whether it should be so or not, that is the fact. Frequently too, they are dealing not only with their parents or grandparents but also their husband's parents; with divorce and separation the alienation and distancing goes on even more so. Frequently, many women have had to quit their jobs in order to carry out caregiving. The new pioneers are people who have to balance work and family life and it is not just around the children anymore. It is the whole issue of trying to negotiate the community maze of saying "how do I get services for the aged"? There are many services such as homemakers and government services. There are not enough, but they are coming.

At the Family Service Association, for instance, we have something called "Senior Support Services". One of the most popular programs is the "Senior's Winter Break". They go outside the city for ten days and, if they are able to, there are programs for skiing, snowshoeing, etc. This gives both the senior and the caregiver a break. There are also groups that are run to help with caregivers and to give them counselling and support. Many companies have Employee Assistance Programs where this type of counselling and help in negotiating the maze is available. We have instances of industry, community, as well as the public and private sector all working together. The issue, of course, is how to connect the family, the people needing the help, with the resources. A company can do a great deal by bringing in Employee Assistance Programs, providing education and putting on workshops.

The families themselves have a great problem of isolation in many situations. Often with both people working, or in the case of divorce, the task falls upon one person. This means that those of us who can provide service, those of us in industry and those who are involved with either government or in agencies such as the Family Service Association need to work together.

Sally MacEwen is a Senior Social Worker with the Corporate Health Division, Family Service Association

KIN CARE

Lisa Taerk

The Canadian elderly are growing. They are a huge segment of the society. Seventy-five and over is presently the biggest segment of our society. Most elderly, even though we institutionalize a great deal, still live independently. They live with relatives, they live by themselves, some are forming new family units, living communaly in big old homes. As we have heard, with our medical advances, our medicare system, and supportive families, we are going to live longer and longer, potentially be much healthier and we will have nagging ailments rather than sudden serious illnesses.

When elderly people need help what they do is go to their adult children or their spouse for care. Caregivers are mostly working caregivers. How can business better equip working caregivers to deal with day-to-day problems of caregiving that is balancing elder care and career? Employees faced with stressful elder care problems impact on their companies in numerous ways. There is increased absenteeism, much more lateness, distraction on the job, and personal phone calls. Time is spent arranging appointments with doctors, transportation and home care. There are people quitting their jobs because they cannot afford either the price of two kinds of care or they cannot afford the time.

Then, there is always the feel crummy days, taking care of mother days, I do not know what to do so I am staying home day that does not show up. All these numbers impact on the company's most important statistic, their bottom line. Productivity suffers the stresses of elder care and more and more this costs the company money. A study from Manitoba, called the Manitoba Longitudinal Study, which was begun in 1970 illustrates some points and implies others. On the vertical axis we have the hours spent caregiving per week and on the horizontal axis activities of daily living, which include helping an elder with eating, drinking, dressing, toileting, getting up out of bed, getting out of a chair, etc. With one activity of daily living the caregiver puts in an average of nine hours per week. When the caregiver is working with two activities of daily living they are likely to be putting in fourteen. When the numbers come up to five or six, they are putting in another full-time job. The chart tells us that as the need for help in the activities of daily living increases, so does the number of hours spent in helping by the caregiver. That is obvious. What the data does not tell us, is that older caregivers care for older relatives and, therefore, as the caregivers get older and as their responsibility gets bigger in their company, they are caring for older people, they are spending more hours at the office and they are spending more hours working at home. These typical caregivers are 55 years old, middle or upper management people and their parents are very old and very needy. This leaves a company paralyzed with its most highly skilled and experienced employees very stressed. They end up pursuing two full-time jobs. When a fifty-hour work week is combined with eleven or twelve hours of caregiving the pressure is a never ending cycle on the caregiver. The pressure here becomes a double whammy because what has been found is that 60% of families in the Canadian and United States studies have two income earners and most often two income earners are supporting two elder care roles as well. The traditional core of housewife/caregiver is evaporating. Women are flooding the workforce. If that is the case in 2/3 of families, why are there so few corporate initiatives involved in helping working caregivers?

The first answer is a lack of executive awareness. Dr. Kreedon from the National Council on Aging says, "As recently as 1986 Chief Executive Officers, Vice Presidents, management people and supervisors had never even heard the word elder care". In my thesis, I put together a management survey that included management and higher and an employee survey that included working people. The question is, "If you had an elder care problem who would you tell?" The employer survey was, "If an employee had an elder care problem would you hear about it, how would you hear about it, would the employee tell you?" The employer answer was "We have an open door policy, we have a wonderful relationship with out employees, of course we would hear about it". The employee survey said "No way, I tell my secretary to close my door, I'm out on an appointment, I'm doing something really important, but cover for me and I'll be gone for a couple of hours".

The fact that emerged was that the confusion occurred because

employees do not want anyone to know. This is not a legitimate work concern. It is not part of the social conscience.

The second barrier to elder care response was that if employees do not tell anyone then they do not feel their employers can be a source of support. In some of my interviews caregivers said they did not figure employers could be a potential source of support. They did not even know who to talk to in the company to look for support, who might know where the community resources were. The third barrier is the party line response to inquiries about new benefits. The Retirement Advisor's Incorporated reported that the typical response to elder care inquiries was, "stirring up new demands is bad, leave well enough alone, go home, thank you very much".

It is my feeling that in today's competitive business market it behooves the corporation to develop and provide new benefits to aid productivity and increase the bottom line. A recent example that occured in our office can demonstrate the last point. Florence was an office manager, well liked, competent, brilliant, moving right along in her career but she was forced to pass up a promotion that was offered to her that necessitated nearly double the hours on the job. She is a primary caregiver for her Uncle Joe. Three days a week she drops him off at a day care centre, she picks him up on the way home and cares for him in the evenings. Although Florence exemplified all the characteristics of the loyal, hard working employee ready for advancement, she also exemplifies the modern Canadian dilemma. Faced with the pressures of career and family she felt stressed to her limit. She told a colleague who mentioned to Florence that he knew where she could get some answers. She called our office and said she needed time to think about her career, about Uncle Joe, about what to do, and she started asking rapid fire questions; "How can I pass up this job, I've worked all my life for it, its what I've been waiting for, how can I leave him at home, how can I move". The promotion involved moving out of the province. When she called, the counsellor listened to Florence and her description of the situation as she perceived it. She was helped through a systematic evaluation of her needs to develop some strategies and promote choices. With today's technology, alternatives were accessed in seconds. This allowed Florence to hear them, think about them and make informed decisions based on counselling and up-to-the-second information on elder care. Elder care information services are an integral part of the new work environment. It is relatively inexpensive for a corporation to adapt and it is unbelieveably expensive for a corporation not to. Phoning, counselling and information services done within the guidelines of social work practice and standards, is fast, professional and confidential.

On February 1, 1988, IBM U.S.A. implemented an Elder Care Referral System similar to the one I just described. During the first month alone over 1% of eligible employees had used the system and calls had ranged from crisis calls to arranging for long-term care and to arrange for long-term planning. It is a must today for businesses to begin to provide new benefits that are flexible, creative and proactive including flex time, flexible benefit plans, work scheduling. Benefits must incorporate child care and elder care. They are tools of protection of the employee, that is the bottom line. We need to impress upon all the corporate people that in order to increase the bottom line we need to protect and hold on to employees.

Lisa Taerk is Director, Kin Care

TORONTO DOMINION BANK

Margo Potter

Lisa has gone into details on what employers should be doing and I am happy to say that Toronto Dominion Bank is meeting the challenge. I want to talk about why an employer should be concerned about this issue and some of the things that are being done.

There is certainly an uneven level of activity in terms of what employers are doing. As has been mentioned, women are the primary care givers. This has not been as much of an issue in the last fifty years as it is starting to become now because more and more women are in the workforce. Therefore, there are fewer volunteers to support elder care and other social services. This vacuum creates a role for the employer.

At Toronto Dominion 73.1% of our full-time employees are women and 93.3% of our part-time employees are women. That is a huge portion of our population

who are being directly affected by these kinds of issues. On the other side of that, in terms of the age of the employees who are having to deal with this issue, it is typically those who are over 45. At present there is about 14.6% of our employees in this age group who are having to deal directly with this issue. They tend to be the people in more senior jobs. They are in a position of seniority with authority, responsibility and higher wages. Therefore, we have an increased interest in how they are using their time.

In terms of performance any issue that impacts on performance is going to be an employer's concern. The fastest way to get attention on this issue from an employer is to talk about business costs. You have to be able to cost justify any program on a bottom-line basis or you are accused of being a warm fuzzy and you are ignored.

The way to do that is to talk about absenteeism, performance, and personal business done on employer time, etc. This issue is a little different from child care because its an ending, not a beginning. Children present an exciting time, even though there are details of finding alternative child care arrangements. With parents, trying to find care arrangements can be a very depressing and guilt-ridden time. That impacts more on how an employee reacts to their work and the stresses at work. They end up taking more time off, closing the door and using the phone for hours to make arrangements. That is not very effective for a bank; we do not pay people to come to work and arrange their personal lives. We want to do something to expedite that process, to make it easier for employees to get the kind of care that they feel they need for their parents and to get arrangements in place and to do preparatory work. The faster it is resolved, the faster the employee is back on stream.

The last point to consider is organizational influence. I think this is a very political issue, but a key one. The caregivers in child care tend to be young women. The caregivers in elder care tend to be older people. Although we have said that women are the primary caregivers this issue impacts on men too as their parents require help as well. The reality in organizations today is that the senior executives, the Chief Executive Officers, the Presidents tend to be male and in that over 45 age group. The elder care issue will likely touch them personally where child care does not. When their children were young their wives dealt with it. Elder care is an issue where they are in a position of power in terms of being able to get something done about it and it is touching them directly. They understand what the issue is and why it is a problem. The politics are in our favour in terms of getting something done. There is increased press around this issue and that creates an awareness and groundswell of support as well.

More and more flexible benefits are becoming a reality in the business world. Toronto Dominion has a flexibile plan; it is in a preliminary stage. But, as benefit plans get more and more sophisticated there will be options where you opt for an elder care supplement if you need to put your parent in a home or for child care if that is your need.

What are we at Toronto Dominion doing about this issue? We have to take a three-pronged approach. Firstly, it is very important that there is a policy, a guideline, some framework for understanding for managers and supervisors. In a bank that has 25,000 employees, there are hundreds of supervisors who have hundreds of different styles of management and different ways of reacting to certain situations. Dealing with personal situations as a supervisor is always a slightly touchy affair. There are never clear cut rules on what should and should not be done. We at T.D. have a dependent care policy which deals with both the child and the elder care issues. It basically is a set of guidelines to managers on how to deal with situations where an employee, for whatever emergency reason, cannot come into work for three hours or three days or whatever. The policy gives supervisors some flexibility in terms of giving people time off for a couple of hours, or a couple of days if necessary. Both are paid. If someone needs more time there is a leave-of-absence program which requires approval of divisonal human resources. Also, we have lots of other options, including a huge part-time work force, flex time and job sharing.

The second prong is to provide some practical assistance. Employers can buy computor resource guides to have in the workplace so employees can access that information easily. Another product which is very practical is an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) and a lot of larger employees are moving towards EAP's. The T.D. has one and it is just being launched across Ontario. The Employee Assistance Program helps in two ways. It can provide that resource assistance. It is hard to get a resource guide to cover every location across the country effectively. With EAP, we are set up with a provider who has

counsellors in or close to each town in which we have a branch and those counsellors are accountable to know what the resources are within that community. Apart from providing the information on what is available in the community, the EAP also gives the caregiver some counselling help in terms of dealing with issues of guilt, depression and anxiety around the change in their parents. Employees are sometimes suspicious of using EAP's and that can be a downside as compared to a resource guide.

The third prong is education and information. There is a big role for employers to play here. Warner Lambert has just set up quite an extensive information package. They are addressing three populations, people interested in the issue; a seminar which is directed at people who are aging (e.g. what can I do as a 60 year old to put some of the mechanisms in place to make it easier on my family); and the third seminar is directed toward employees, how do you deal with it, how do you deal with the emotions, how do you access information, where do you go, what is out there in the community to help you and what can the employer do to support the employee through that time.
At the Toronto Dominion Bank we are strong on policy, but weaker on education/information. We have run lunch seminars to talk about the issue and we put some articles in our employee publication to deal with this. We need to be more specific however. Employers are moving in the right direction, some companies are getting there faster than others. T.D. has done a lot. We are very advanced on this issue.

Margot Potter is Manager, Employment Standards Policy, Toronto Dominion Bank, Toronto

FORUM: A SHARED RESPONSIBILITY

Moderator: Valerie Pringle
Panel: Martin Elliott Roger Purdie Jeff Rose Elaine Todres

Elaine Todres

Very briefly I want to talk about four or five issues related to work and family. First, I would like to say it is obviously an issue whose time has come. I was at an international conference on productivity about eight months ago where the issue of work and family was considered at a workshop off in some marginalized corner of a very, very large hotel. The keynote speaker was the Federal Secretary of Labour and she came before the crowd and said she was terrifically disappointed that the organizers of the conference had not understood that work and family is the number one issue facing business, the labour movement and government in this decade; and indeed, the issue that we will be facing the rest of the new century.

It is not surprising that we saw that the New York Times last Sunday had on its first page, an article on the harmonization of work and family. The issue has arrived. The International Labour Organization has had a standard on the harmonization of work and family for something like fifteen years. We are finally coming around to what the United Nations discovered some time ago. I do not have to describe for you what the demographic backdrop is for work and family, only to say that according to the 1986 census, in my opinion, the single-earner family is now an archeological artifact. One-third of our families are now two-earner families; 10% of our families are led by single parents; 1/3 of those who are over the age of 65 are disabled.

Clearly, what we are facing now is a social transformation of epic proportions. Women in North America have been in the labour force in prominant numbers since the 1950's and some 38 years later we, as a society in North America, are only beginning to grapple with equal pay for work of equal value, child care, employment equity and the irradication of family violence and sexual abuse, whose victims are primarily women.

I think the caution we have to bear in mind is that no advances in work and family can be made at the cost of women. In the New York Times article an international consultant cautions that the harmonization of women's work and the work and family dimension will mean that women will settle for less. I urge all of you to believe and understand that women will not settle for less.

We all know that we have to collaborate. The premise upon which this debate and exchange of information is based, is that it can only be proceeded on the basis of synergy and partnership. What is it that we have to collaborate on? I think we have to collaborate on about five or six issues. One is improved access to high quality government and community-based services. The doors cannot open at 9:00 a.m. and close at 4:00 p.m. We have to look at the economic viability of alternative work arrangements for workers; we have to look at the economic viability of caregiving professions; if we require child care and elder care support we cannot sustain these occupations on the basis of the current wage structure; we have to look at community-based supports both in terms of transportation, respite care for those who are dealing with the elderly, and all of the other supports necessary to make the integration possible. We have to look at the climate in the work environment. What is it like to actually work in that business in that sector? Is it pleasant? Are the values that are espoused actually operational in terms of what our day is like? We have to hope for an equal sharing of responsibility in the home between men and women.

A recent Statistics Canada study indicated that in the last ten years men have contributed on average 15 minutes per day in terms of the allocation of housework and their effort. We have to look at new workforce strategies in terms of the terms and conditions of employment.

How do we get there? This is the point I really want to make and I hope it will be part of our conversation this afternoon. We do not get to the issue of work and family by appealing to social justice. One has to appeal to economics. It seems to me that we need three significant paradigm shifts to occur.

The first is a shift in values. Who owns the problem? It is not women alone who own the problem. What is the reality of the labour supply condition in Canada today and who owns the solution; it is not one sector that owns the solution.

The second paradigm shift has to occur in the nature of collective bargaining where collective

bargaining occurs. We have to believe in true partnership and that means a different form of leadership and a different type of negotiation, and content being negotiated where the labour force is unionized. We also have to have an agreement, almost a social contract between the partners in terms of what is a sustainable pace for negotiations on collective bargaining.

We have to have a third shift in the private sector; we have to re-examine the premises upon which the entire human resource edifice is constructed, in the areas of recruitment, succession, compensation policy and glass ceilings. An example of this is that for the last 20 to 25 years there has been a premise in human resources that John Doe will be prepared to move from Moncton, to Wawa, to Toronto, to Vancouver, to move from the regional plant to the headquarters, from the research facility to the manufacturing environment in order to become part of the career path through Vice President of Research, to Vice President of Finance or whatever other position. Those premises are simply no longer valid because of the integration of work and family in a very, very direct way.

This means that in the private sector and, indeed, in government as well, we have to re-examine the fundamental underpinnings of the way in which we pay people, reward people and motivate people and allocate benefits to them.

That is all we have to do!

Roger Purdie

I am afraid the premise Elaine described is still true. Gordon Thompson was to be here but experienced one of those shifts November 1st and has lifted his family up from Toronto and relocated to Houston, Texas.

This happens a lot in our industry and is one of the major challenges we face in our business and I could not agree more with what Elaine said about that.

Balancing the needs of job and family certainly for me is not a new issue. In my twenty-five years I have been struggling hard with it on a personal level. It is certainly a changing issue and changing in many visible and important ways. Single parent families and dual career families are bringing this very much to a level of importance and visibility.

The responsibility for looking at the mechanisms that try to deal with the issue, probably over-simplifying it, but I think it is a shared responsibility by all of the stakeholders involved; the individuals themselves and their families, business and labour, government and society at large as well as the volunteer movement. They all have a stake in what we are talking about here.

Commenting on the stakeholders, certainly the individual her/himself has a real important job in trying to work that balance of demands between their family needs and job needs. Business has to work very hard at trying to balance those personal needs that employees have with the needs of the shareholders who are obviously looking for a productive workforce and what goes, flows from that. Business, in my view, has a responsibility to enable employees through their policies and programs to try and manage in this tough balance that we all face.

At Esso Petroleum Canada it is not an easy job at all but some of the things we are trying to do are: flex time, job sharing, part-time work, parental leave and we are about to get into dependent care information systems that will be available for our employees. We have informal parental support groups in different locations, an employee assistance program, and stress counselling which is provided by the company in major locations across Canada where we have large blocks of people. Implementing these policies and programs certainly is not without its challenges and frustrations. The worry about the short-term impacts on productivity is certainly one that the supervisors feel. However, I think we are coming to the conclusion that ignoring the fact that employees need these kind of programs to support the balancing act they face is going to have a long-term impact on our business's success and our ability to attract and retain a highly qualified, motivated and productive workforce.

The provision of the policies and programs is not enough. That comes from our own experience. We have to guard against the subtle views and practices that still exist in large measure where we find the use and application of these programs being frustrated in different ways. The percentage of our own population that is taking advantage of the programs I described to you is very low. We have a number of mechanisms to

try and tap into the viewpoints and get the feedback and communication that helps us understand why that is. We have a number of internal employee equity focus groups. Women speak out about examples in which, prior to their pregnancy leave supervisors stopped giving them challenging work to do; a perception that the energy level and committment may not be there the way it normally is prior to maternity leave, and then the same thing happens on the return from leave. Also, instead of allowing for an adjustment period to allow the new parent to ease into a new role and responsibilities both at home and probably a new role at work as well, they are often pressed into a high demand day one situation without the understanding that needs to go with it. Performance is perceived to tail off and not meet the historical high standards for the individual and this in turn creates more stress.

We have to keep helping our supervisors to be on the lookout for opportunities to put what we think are good policies and programs to work and to help them understand how they can better do that.

Business has to keep in the forefront of understanding the needs and interests that its employees and the population at large have as our population is going through the very significant demographic shift that Elaine's statistics spoke of.

Jeff Rose

From labour's standpoint, is it a shared responsibility? Yes, of course it is. That is to say that society is an organism of inter-relationships, complex, competing inter-relationships often with crosscurrents that have to be addressed. The competing interests of individual choice vs individual responsibility, social values vs individual values, self-interest vs the general interest are very hard to balance. And nowhere are they as difficult as with these issues.

Society, of course, does balance these issues now. Generally speaking the way society has done that is that every person is left to herself/himself. Certain interventions have been made by government on behalf of the public to take the edge off the hardest aspects: maternity leave up to a point is provided, UIC is given in certain cases and that takes the edge off a little bit. Unions are allowed to bargain collectively and we can achieve some gains, but we in labour think that society needs to set new strategic directions in the area of work and family issues. There has to be change. In other words, change if women are to achieve equality in the workplace and in society, change if fathers are to be involved in the care and nurturing of their children and change if human well-being (parenting, elder care, dependent care, etc.) is to be accorded at least as compelling a status in society as that of productivity.

What would labour like to see in order to give these new directions that I have referred to? In a nutshell, we start from the belief in a comprehensive system to enable parents with dependents to combine paid employment with their family responsibilities. Society must decide and make it happen. That means a great deal of governmental action and to single out the three most important elements of such a system it should include legislation to ensure the right to leave, a combination of public and employer funding to ensure income maintenance during the leave, and third, a proper child care system.

In the context of leave for family responsibilities, labour believes that Federal and Provincial Governments should respond to the changing composition and the changing needs of the workforce by establishing minimum standards in labour standards legislation to provide for such leave. There is also substantial room for improvement in existing provisions as well. Certainly, providing the right to family leave in legislation would be a cost to employers and to taxpayers but we think that it is a question of deciding what kind of society we want to build. Otherwise, it is all just rhetoric. We believe very strongly also that in the absence of such provisions labour can, and attempts to, play a role (nowhere near as effective as society can do through its tool of government), but we continue to negotiate family leave provisions and as with Medicare our goal is to exert pressure through our collective bargaining successes on legislators to act on these important issues.

Second is income maintenance. UI and maternity benefits provide 60% of usual earnings with a cap and a two-week waiting period. This is not at all adequate. The Federation of Women Teachers of Ontario have recently calculated that for the average school board the cost to top up, to provide for no loss of income in cases of maternity leave, would work out to about .4% of total salary costs. This is not a prohibitive amount.

Third, the labour movement's views on child care are well known and they stem from several perspectives. As parents and

grandparents we want dependable, caring and stimulating care for all the children who need it. As taxpayers we want our tax dollars to be put to the best possible use. As public employees we want to be able to provide quality services and as trade unionists we want fair treatment for those who provide those services. Hence, you have probably heard the list of adjectives; we want universal access to a comprehensive, government funded, non-commercial, high quality and accessible system of child care services for all families who wish to use the services.

We would like also to see the Federal Government establish national standards and national objectives for Provincial participation in cost sharing for a child care system. I raise this not to get into the Meech Lake controversy but merely to point out that that would be no different than the essential features of other national programs presently existing in Canada. National objectives, we believe, should address comprehensiveness, equal access and the requirement for non-profit nature and could be established without undermining traditional jurisdictional responsibilities, Federal or Provincial.

We support the system recommended by the Katie Cook Task Force, which is a system of Federal financing based on a phased-in and incremental approach where direct grants would be cost-shared by the Federal and Provincial governments. Through a child care financing act, in other words. The Federal Government funds health care and post-secondary education, which are Provincial responsibilities but Federally regulated. The constitutional funding precedents do exist to build such a comprehensive and universal accessible system. None of us would say that establishing such a system would be cheap, but we are saying that the parents and children of Canada need it and the long-term implications, both economic and social, outweight the costs. Until we can achieve that through government action, unions continue to negotiate subsidies for dependent care, we continue to negotiate where we can for workplace day care and we continue to put pressure on government. It is to be hoped that this and the other two key elements, leave and income maintenance, will in due course become accepted public policy planks of a truly humane society.

Some quick notes on unions and our responsibility. What role do I think we need to play in society in integrating work and family responsibilities? From an internal standpoint let me tell you that the impact of increased participation by women in the paid labour force in the last two decades has affected unions. Not only have certain issues become priorities in bargaining that were not there before, but also there is an impact on our internal operations.

For example, our National Constitution has just been amended to provide that delegates to our conventions are guaranteed child care expenses. All the major conferences of my union at the national level now offer some sort of child care as well, whether it is on-site or reimbursement of costs. That happened for two reasons. First, because we knew that the absence of child care was a barrier to participation in union acivities by parents, especially women, and second because we wanted to show employers that it could be done.

In the context of bargaining, unions, particularly in the public sector, have had some success in negotiating paid leave for family responsibilities, not enough yet, but these include some top-up provisions for maternity leave, and subsidies for child care costs. Perhaps it has not always been as high on the agenda as it should have been, but when you are fighting against contracting out, privatization, free trade as well as trying to maintain the purchasing power of people's wages, sometimes other important issues yield pride of place. I should also point out that when we do attempt to negotiate family leave or maternity benefits we often meet with significant opposition from employers. Not always, but often. Sometimes the opposition is shrewd, would provide for the individuals who would benefit from the particular clauses that we are attempting to negotiate to have to pay the price themselves. For example, when we deal with employers that say they are happy to work out a job sharing arrangement with us but unfortunately the incumbants of the divided job would then be out of the bargaining unit. That happens fairly frequently. Or, when we try to negotiate alternative work schedules but then the employer says fine that means no overtime under any circumstances for the people that we are trying to negotiate that for.

We do endeavour to introduce flexibility but not at the price of inferior conditions for the people that we are negotiating for and we do not intend to compromise our role either.

The financial burden of parenthood is felt by us in the labour movement to be not simply a matter of personal choice and responsibility but all of society has a stake in the next generation. We think it is about time that social programs and policies reflected that responsibility and a realistic acceptance, a willingness, to pay the price of the changing roles of family and work.

Martin Elliott

Today I am only representing myself not the company. It is hard to define work. Some people work 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. , some people work shifts, some people are white collar workaholics and work 24 hours per day. What is family? Is it a two-person income, a single person income, a six o'clock parent who comes home to look after the children. These are unclear definitions.

The key thing that appears is that there is certainly a conflict between work and family no matter how you look at it. From my own experience I have come across quite a few symptoms of this conflict in my own employment. One of the first symptoms is overtime. In many jobs you are expected to put in extra hours and indeed it is sort of frowned upon if you mention you have to go home to family a little later in the evening, or what about the son's hockey game or the daughter's recital? How do you work these things in with your life and your employment?

Another thing is equal opportunity. I have been involved in hiring a few people and I have had my boss say to me we have a lot of women in the organization and we do not want them all to get pregnant at once. Unfortunately, there are real people out there saying things like that. In upper executive levels within organizations there is still a long way to go. That is another problem and symptom of the issue because women have a particularly sensitive point of view and until they are represented as a true majority there is a long way to go.

Another minor issue is paternity leave. If you happen to have a baby you are lucky if you get two or three days off generally. That is considered to be a nice, sufficient time.

A few other symptoms are relocation or moving to a new job. For example, right now I have taken a new job in Deep River, Ontario. Moving from Toronto to Deep River is a very difficult thing to do. How does a company expect to attract people in that situation if the wife is working as well? To what extent is the company responsibile for a family? Do they care? Is their primary function to attract people or to keep them and if so, for how long?

There are a lot of symptoms to the conflict and basically my conclusion is that work is important to us, we work to make some income, job satisfaction or maybe it could be a status thing. A lot of us were brought up in the 50's and 60's in a traditional family where the Mom stayed at home and now we are going out in a different environment and we are hitting that conflict. We are trying to mesh our beginnings with the current situation. It is very difficult.

The best solution would be a changing of attitudes. This is not going to be easy and education is the key to that. Conferences like this are useful to that end but we have a long way to go.

Valerie Pringle

Is this generation of baby boomers creating needs that cannot be met? Are they selfish, demanding things their own way? Is it ridiculous to think companies will care? Are we creating needs that can't be met? Are these just nice ideas?

Elaine Todres

I want to make one thing clear, these are my personal views. Let me share with you an anecdote I had as a boss. One of my male senior people came to me the other day and we were discussing hours of work. When you work directly for a Minister you do not necessarily have much control over your day. This man who does not have children, said, "You know, I value my marriage and I want to work on my marriage. I want to be a good partner in my marriage and this current environment is affecting my family, my wife and I". The second point I want to make, because we have had a lot of discussion on child care, and that is, child care is an absolute prerequisite for the economic equality of women and men. I want to also bring to us the attention of people who do not have children but have responsibily for their parents and that is a very, very significant issue. I, myself as an employer, as a manager, have many, many circumstances during the day where an appointment will be cancelled and someone will say my father is an Alzheimers victim and there was an incident. I have to go to the hospital, I have to go to the nursing home, etc. That is the reality of what we are talking

about from the baby boomers.

Are these needs that cannot be met? Are these unrealistic expectations? I think that is the wrong question. The question should be, if we do not meet these needs, not only what is our society going to look like, but what is our economy going to look like? We have insufficient numbers of workers. There are supply shortages in every single sector in this economy. Workers will be women, they will be men, they will be in these new kinds of family relationships that we have and so we have to come to grips with it as a society.

The other point is that none of this can be discussed without talking about what are some of the most basic things that have to happen in a work force so that a woman is respected. All of you have been reading the papers reporting sexual harrassment, not the incidents, but the reporting is absolutely staggering these days. Let us not move on to the forum of work and family without forgetting some of the fundamental prerequisites in our society with respect to equality. Basically, what we have to do here, although it is a struggle, is to develop new social inventions.

Valerie Pringle

Who is going to do it?

Elaine Todres

I think the government will do some of it, but you know, the government reacts in the same way as the private sector or unions do. It reacts to supply and demand. I cannot tell you how many situations I come upon where I talk to Chief Executive Officers in either the public or private sector and they will say "I do not know what this issue is. No one in my workforce tells me they have problems with the integration of work and family". I have not been visited upon, as a senior official, by any large numbers of groups, other than in the Feminist Movement and in the Labour Movement, and it has been isolated to say "You had better regulate to alter the Employment Standards Act". There are specific requests so you have a job to do out there; the demand has to be made.

Valerie Pringle

I think people start saying, of course, unions would think this and government has to say these things and what is business going to do. You pay lip service to it and say yes you have to move in that direction. Can you afford not to change or can you afford to change?

Roger Purdie

I think it is both. We cannot afford not to change and the little menu of things we are trying to do and not doing a lot of them necessarily well, are absolutely essential and what I would like to zero in on is the pressure that is placed on the supervisors in any organiztion. In our business organization, given the realization of the type of pressures we are talking about here that are very real and the needs that are going to have to be satisfied, the people that are charged with providing direction to their work unit at whatever level in an organization have generally come there through a route where the kind of norms, values and skills that have been traditionally practiced are not necessarily the kind that are going to move us forward and allow us to deal with these issues.

Elaine mentioned leadership and that is what I am talking about. Leadership at all levels in any organization providing those people with the skills to cope.

Valerie Pringle

You said in your opening remarks that people are not taking up the programs that exist now. Why? Is it perceived that that is sort of a wimpy thing to do or do they not know about them, or do supervisors discourage it. Have you figured out why?

Roger Purdie

I think it is all of those. I have mentioned some of them,that people in our own organization are for sure telling us. Those are the reasons and we can understand them and it is a real challenge to try and make those changes. They are not simple ones because most of them are behaviour changes.

Elaine Todres

I think it is called active listening. When I talk about the attitude or the ethos or the spirit of an organization, when it is the women who have to go to the male supervisor to ask for this, that or the other; it is difficult to do. In the Ontario Government we are very fortunate. Jeff outlined for you some of the gains that have been made for collective bargaining in terms of paid maternity leave. We have an option now that beyond the 17

weeks of paid maternity leave any mother can go directly to her Deputy Minister for up to a year of unpaid leave with UIC.

The fact of the matter is very few women take it up. Why? Because they cannot afford to. Because when you are in a two-family situation and require the money, you cannot take some of these benefits; so there is the economics and Jeff has alluded to some of these comments; when you talk about part-time and you strip someone's union rights, that is not dealing with work and family.

One of the problems we have is that it has been defined as a women's issue; it has not been defined as a management issue; it has not been defined as a father's issue; and it is has not been defined as a societal issue. In many cases in the organizational unit it is the Employment Equity Co-ordinator or the Manager of Human Relations somewhere off in an obscure corner of the building and not the line manager, which is I think what Roger is suggesting that has to take ownership of these real issues.

I was talking to a woman last night on this subject and she said "I go to meetings in my department at 6:00 or 7:00 at night and when the man gets up and says 'excuse me, I have to do my babysitting tonight', everybody stands up and applauds because one night out of 365 days this father says he has to go home and babysit. I do this for 365 days a year and I'm still here for the night meeting".

Jeff Rose

The question was, can we afford these things, are we creating needs that cannot be met? I have two perspectives on that. It is a matter of priorities I think.

There is only a certain amount of wealth to go around and there are priorities to be decided. Priorities are decided by government after they listen to the dictates of the public. I, for one, am greatly disappointed that after people have worked very hard for over a decade in this country to bring the day care question on to the public agenda as never before, and just as it was about to be steared into limbo by Bill C144, the federal election (from the standpoint of child care in this country) went the wrong way. I think that is a terrible setback for women. I think it is a terrible setback for what we are talking about here. Of course, one can discuss in the context of individual crises and dilemmas and one can certainly talk in the context of labour management incompatibilities. But there is a macro level too, and at the macro level the party that stood for the worst of the three options being presented to the entire Canadian population won a majority. I am only trying to remind people that it is not just managers who make these decisions, it is also the public and it is the government that listens to the public. I am afraid we are going to have to fight that battle for a lot longer than if the public had dictated a different result.

Valerie Pringle

If business is listening to that though or looking at that result, again it is how much longer can you delay dealing with these issues, to say it is not at the top of the agenda. The Human Resources person will look after it for another five years.

Jeff Rose

I feel that it should be looked after at the level of a national program, which is one of the ways in which society can deal with these kinds of questions. This is one very important piece of the puzzle when it comes to work and family responsibilities, and the voters blew it!

The other observation I want to make is that many of the solutions that are being talked about in a conference such as this are, of course, relevant to people who find themselves with the dilemma of family responsibilities vs work responsibilities. But there are millions of other workers for whom that is not the major problem. I want to remind people that, respect of part-time work, which would definitely be a God-send for some, there are lots of others who do not make a living wage working part-time and do not want to work part-time. It is salutary, I think, to remind ourselves that these are not only in the unionized sector, but there are many unorganized workers in this country for whom the part-time solution would mean even worse conditions than they presently face, who want full-time work, who want that to be well remunerated and do not have that opportunity.

Valerie Pringle

Martin, how responsible do you feel your company is for you? We are all employees here too, do you really feel that they owe you anything or you deserve more from them, or they should be looking out for you and your family and your parents and your kids?

Martin Elliott

That is a good point. It is hard to first of all talk about a company or organization, that is part of the reason I think they get away with so much, who do you look at? The company is faceless in a sense, you report to your supervisor and up the chain, and a company can often evade any responsibilities simply by its nature of passing the buck.

Valerie Pringle

Do you think they owe it to you though? You just do not know who to go after or do you think you have any right to go after anyone?

Martin Elliott

I am not trying to claim all sorts of rights. I think that is part of the lack of definition of the problem. What should I expect? Is life a treadmill? How far does one push? How far do unions have the right to influence management?

Valerie Pringle

I am wondering about your point of view as an employee. Take the case where your parents are not well and they are moving you, do you feel they should not be moving you? If you turn this down will they offer you something better; you have your wife to consider, etc.

Martin Elliott

Okay, what happens if your child is sick, that is a concrete problem. You wake up in the morning and the child has something seriously wrong. You look over and your wife is sick and she is the one who is supposed to be staying home, so what do you do? My wife works at home, but there is a problem right there. Okay, you're honest, you phone up and say "Listen, we're sick here, I've got to stay home." The boss says "What about the project, we're due tomorrow." So you say, "well, I'll come in on the weekend" or something like this. I think the key is honesty but you are always juggling priorities and to what extent does the company kick in with policy.

Valerie Pringle

Elaine, you have kids, you're working like 7:30 a.m. meetings, they schedule four nights of meetings and you don't see your family. Do you say, "Look, you owe, me, I've got a family," or do you say I'm a Deputy Minister and it is expected of me to keep the pace. When an employee comes to you and says 'My marriage is suffering' do you say 'that's too bad or do you say, 'get serious, you're in this and if you want to go somewhere you have to perform'.

Elaine Todres

I feel terrible doing it for myself but I know what I should be saying theoretically. Theoretically, the organization has a responsibility. Because the fact of the matter is you are not much of a worker, speaking for myself, if I am not reading books, going to movies and spending time with my children, looking at the arts page, what new ideas am I bringing to my job? I am there from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. That is not a classical definition of renewing myself and bringing fresh and new exciting ideas to the way I manage my labour/management relations with my union.

Valerie Pringle

But are you saying that to your Minister?

Elaine Todres

Yes, I am saying to my male colleagues that I would rather not eat breakfast at 7:30 a.m. because they happen to be empty nesters and have managed to get in their exercise program at 6:00 a.m. and are prepared to meet me at 7:30 a.m. I say, no, I cannot do it. I guess the other point I want to make is yes, the employer has a responsibility in the long term for establishing a humane environment in which we have to work with or without a union partner, depending on the circumstances that that employer faces. The individual has a responsibility too. One final point is that workers are changing. The worker who used to say 'I will work from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and I will be a lifer with the company' does not exist anymore. There have been lots of citations in the newspaper in the last couple of weeks where people are saying my life is rich, I've got other things I want to do, so when I talk about new premises we are not going to be able to extract that commitment now. In the public sector it is somewhat different; you report to a Minister and you have to do

certain things. I feel very strongly that the government has to introduce certain pieces of legislation, individuals have to do things and managers have to make the conditions possible.

Valerie Pringle

Roger, do you find people changing? Do they not want to move, do they not want to work a long time, are they saying look after me or I'm dust?

Roger Purdie

I cannot state strongly enough how volatile the situation has become in the past five years. Trying to do the things we might have done 10 to 15 years ago in moving people around our company would not even get out of the starting blocks today. It is just not reasonable to expect it. The change is incredible. It is not just the huge geographic moves but the day-to-day situations where people are needing to leave the meeting at 5 o'clock. They have commitments, males and females. Increasingly, this becomes more the accepted, expected norm of behavior and as long as you have supervisors that are sanctioning and okaying that kind of behavior by their action, it grows and gets reinforced and becomes more legitimate, as it should.

Question from Floor

I am interested in the idea of consensus and partnerships but what I am wondering is if there are any mechanisms in place, that any of you can address that we can utilize to effect partnerships, how we will arrive at consensus, what are the mechanisms for many groups in society working together over these issues?

Jeff Rose

There are institutions that are supposed to facilitate decisions, hard choices between competing imperatives. One of them is the political system and I have already had my shot on that. Another one is collective bargaining. Whenever there is a desire to achieve something that people feel is important they exort the two partners in the collective bargaining process just to 'get together'. It is not that simple. There are many legitimate concerns on the employers' side when unions come to the table and say they want fourteen different things. There also have to be decisions made about priorities in the context of the process that is collective bargaining, that will push some issues forward but maybe not always as fast as some people would like. We are on the cutting edge of public policy in some ways, but unions realize that we cannot have everything at once.

Elaine Todres

I have some thoughts on that subject. First of all, for an example, I was involved in the legislation for pay equity in private and public sectors in Ontario and what I discovered in that struggle was that there is no such thing as the private sector; there is no such thing as a monolithic business. There are private sectors. It is not clear when organizations speak, as it is clear in the union movement where you have elected leadership what group represents whom and whose views? Like all things politic we have people who are very, very benign about participation so in the free-trade debate you have the Canadian Federation of Independent Business commenting on its views on free trade, while at the same time, and I say this in a non-partisan manner, that there are in fact very few members of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business that deal with tradable services and yet that was an organization that was speaking loudly and clearly. So, in talking about the private sectors we have to, in government, establish very formalized relationships. I can only speak of the Provincial government. There are a number of key Ministers who have very real scope over this subject and they are the Minister of Labour who regulates labour standards in this province, the Chairman of Management Board who acts as employer and in many ways test pilotssome of the vanguard policies before they are introduced to the private sector,and there is the Minister of Community and Social Services. Who would you get to talk to those ministers? I believe very strongly that you have to deal with the transformers in our society, and if you forgive the term, not the dinosaurs. It is the transformers who have to be selected, and we have to have positive discussion not in the heat of an occupational health and safety bill that is in the house, not in the heat of pay equity legislation, not in the heat of whatever, but in the common-day prior, and that is now because we do not have emerging legislation on work and family. The other arena is the educational sector. Again, I will use the subject of pay equity. How many lawyers do you suppose who are taking the bar admission courses today are learning about job evaluation,

and gender neutral systems for pay equity? How many accountants do you suppose who are graduating and going to be dealing with the books are looking at pay equity or consortiums to sponsor private sector child care? I suspect we know the answer. How many children today are learning about these things? The fact of the matter is there are one or two very practical things in Ontario that would have an enormous difference. If three or four lecturers who went to the graduating courses of our professionals who will be dealing and giving advice to everyone at this table, whether it is to the media, the government, to the labour movement or the private sector in either advocacy or actual implementation of child care, you name the policies that you have discussed today, would not that make a difference?

Valerie Pringle

I would like to try and congeal this. If everyone here thinks this is so obvious then why isn't it just happening?

Elaine Todres

I think it is not happening because individuals are not making it clear in either their role as citizen, member of political party, member of association or an employee. I have spent a lot of time at the Canadian Conference Board of Canada discussing this subject. When I sit at a round table of Vice President's of Human Resources who talk to me about pension plans, compensation rates for staff, they do not tell me they are hearing issues about work and family. They will, in the context of Roger's comments ask about specific succession problems or specific recruitment problems. They are not hearing from the workers. When governments do not hear any noise in the system, there is no response. When the voices only come from the women's movement and all of the child care advocates have essentially sprung from the women's movement, it is not seen as a broad based issue.

Valerie Pringle

Why aren't people speaking up then? We all have these problems. Is it because they are all perceived as weaknesses or the individual's problems.

Roger Purdie

I think you have a very valid point there and I have run into this situation many times within my own organization where people are saying we will not take a penny of any kind to look after the situation and others go beyond that to say 'I do not need it, I do not care that others require it, I think they should have it, but I do not need it so why would taxpayers money be put in place to provide that to us'. There is that point of view as well. In terms of what can we do, I think we are very low on the learning curve but we are hearing, we are asking the questions, we are inviting the input from our employees and we are listing and we have a long way to go. I think we have started and the behavior change is really the cultural shift that Elaine mentioned at the outset. It has to happen with the people that are providing direction to other people in the workplace.

Jeff Rose

There are some very provocative theories about why it is that it is not gaining ground as much as some people would like. It is very interesting to think about the whole stigma attached to this area of life. And then there is guilt. And then there are many needs that people hold back from expressing. I just remain convinced (maybe I am one of those of nature's optimists who believe) that if people do take goals seriously enough and express them in the way Elaine has, activity will produce changes. Because all that has to happen is for people to demand these things in the right way and insist that their representatives carry them out. Then they will happen. That is the way to get things done. On the other hand if society continues to wring its hands and wonder why it is that there are so many needs that are unmet, then I guess we only have ourselves to blame. When people decide to set aside their ingrained reluctance to insist that these very important things get addressed, demand that they be addressed through our system, chiefly the political system, then they will be addressed.

Valerie Pringle

Thank you.

Elaine Todres is Deputy Minister, Human Resources Secretariat, Government of Ontario

Roger Purdie is Vice President Research, Esso Petroleum Canada

Jeff Rose is National President, Canadian Union of Public Employees

Martin Elliott is Manager, Information Systems, Atomic Energy of Canada

Valerie Pringle *is with C.B.C. Midday.*

CLOSING REMARKS

Milton Orris

It has been exciting to hear things discussed with passion as they have been here. People standing up at the microphone speaking in front of their peers and speaking with such passion and concern also is encouraging. I do not believe that changes can occur any other way. Yes, we will fight on social policy fronts; yes, we will try and convince governments to fund things; yes, we will keep knocking at the doors of senior levels of management of corporations; most of all, we will keep carrying out the mission day to day, family to family, child to child, senior citizen to senior citizen, that you represent.

Individual people make enormous differences in their communities and individual agencies make enormous differences in those people's communities. It is a most exciting development that nearly 200 of you chose to come together to share your experiences, share your passion, share your concern and I hope, as you leave, share renewed dedication to keep working towards what I am convinced, not in five years or ten years, but next year or the year after, will begin to be fundamental differences in the way we deal with the issues you have raised at the Work and Family Conference.

Many thanks to the speakers who have come and been provocative, helpful and insightful and especially thanks to you, the people who make so much difference by being here and in the communities where you work.

Milton Orris is the Dean of Continuing Education at Ryerson, Toronto.